THE WHETSTONE OF REPROOFE.

A REPROVING CENSVRE OF THE misintitled safe way: declaring it by discouerie of the authors fraudulent proceeding, & captious cauilling, to be a miere by-way drawing pore trauellers out of the royall & common streete, & leading them deceitfully in to a path of perdition.

Errare fecit eos in inuio, & non in via. Psal. 106.

WITH A POSTSCRIPT OF ADVERtisments, especially touching the homilie & epistles attributed to Alfric: & a compendious retortiue discussion of the misapplyed by-way.

AVTHOR T. T.
Sacristan &, Catholike Romanist.

CATVAPOLI,
Apud viduam MARCI WYONIS.
Anno M. DC. XXXII.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE PREFACE.

I Haue viewed & peruſed exactly a certaine ſmale vollume publiſhed by Sir Hnmfrey Linde. He intituleth it *the ſafe way*, but I findeit containes nothing either ſafe or ſound. To make it more plauſible he giues it a Latin inſcripton printing in the front of it, *via tuta*, not much vnlike to the practiſe of Mountibanks, who to make their pouders more vendible ſet on their boxes ſtrange titles to perſuade the ignorant, they are farre fetched & of care vertue. He calleth it *a Waie leading alle Chriſtians to the true Catholike Church.*

But indeede it is no waye but rather a diuerticle, or diuerſion: or if it be a way, its onely a by-way leading ſinple ſoules into woods & deſerts & leauing them there vnmercifully to be deuoured by rauenous beaſts. If it be any way at all, it is not *via tuta*, but rather *via torta*, & a Kinde of negatiue way conſiſting in negation of the true Catholike way, & therefore according to the doctrine of Ariſtotle, *negatio eſt malignantis naturæ*, *negation is of a malignant*

nature, ſo it being a negatiue way, it cannot poſſible be any other then *via, malignantium, the way of the malignant & reprobate people.* He addes it *leadeth to the true auncient & Catholike faith now profeſſed in the Church of England*, but this confirmeth that which I ſaid before, that his way is no true way but a by-way as leading to a by-place, to a Countrie & people ſeparated from the reſt of the world, conducting to a nation diuided from the reſt of the earth, as in ſituation ſo is it ſeparated in Religion from others, yea from it ſelfe, from the trueth, from antiquitie, as being no more auncient in all poynts then the daies of Queene Elizabeth as her 39. articles plainely teſtifie, diuerſe of them being firſt proclaimed by her & her parliament: hither the way leadeth & there it leaueth the poore traueller at *a non plus*, without any meanes to paſſe vnto Chriſt & his Apoſtles.

Toto diuiſus orbe Britannus.

He ſaith farther in the title that euen the Romaniſts *his aduerſaries doe teſtifie*, the ſafety of his way: but this is moſt ridiculous & moſt falſe of all the reſt of his inſcription; he citeth indeed greate tropes of authors in pretenſe of his poſitions, ſome of which are true Catholike writers, but others not acknowledged for ſuch by vs, others maniſtly knowen to be his owne conſectaries: & all thoſe that are truly ours, he doth eyther malitiouſly, or ignorantly abuſe, & ſo doth but make checker-worke or Croſſe

lines

lines of them alto gether for his miniſters to play in the pulpit with their parishioners at fox & geeſe.

I imagin'd his name had bene Line, but now I perceiue certainely it is not, for he vſeth neither line nor ſquare in his booke, I meane neither method nor ſquare dealing, For ſetting aſide his prologue & Epilogue, his firſt chapter, or ſection might aſwell haue bene the laſt & the laſte his firſt as otherwiſe, & as for his ſinceritie, it is not to be found, either in the beginning, midle or ending: wherefore if his name be Linde as he ſubſcribeth, it is more agreeable to the inſide of his worke, which is very well linde indeede I meane with lies. And the trueth is the greateſt part of his pamphlet is but ouerworne brokery ſtuffe, dropped from *White*, *Way* & *B. Mouton*, patched *Appeale*, forged *Impoſture*, & vshers outrages, excepting ſome french wares taken out of the corrupted ſtore houſe of that famous mountibanke *Daniel Chamiere*, with whom I perceaue his worship hath had no ſmale coreſpondence.

He ſtileth himſelfe knight which no doubt he is, but as that title ſoundes honeſtie, honor, and nobilitie, ſo none of that I finde in his booke, which is ſo replenished with bragges, boaſts, and proteſtations, as one would ſweare him rather to be a proteſting puritan, then a pure Proteſtant.

Which with other reasons moue me to suspect the booke is not his, but a ministerial bastard fathered vpon his nobilitie for the greater authoritie of the worke: but that I will not much examine: onely this I say that when I had read it, I did soma't doubt whether the knight cou'd be so versed in our Roman diuines as (thou' to little purpose) the penner appeeres to be: which caused me to suspect the true authour is some one of greater reading and industrie then I imagin Sir Humfrey is: yet on the other side I am verelie perswaded, that considering the multitude of ignorant absurdities it conteines, the authour of it cannot be a man of any sollide learning in diuinity, which being supposed, I cannot absolutely condemne Sir Humfrey for taking vpon him the name, yet he cannot be iudged wholely excusable in his honor for that he consented to be the putatiue Father of so base a bratte.

Spuria multorum patrum proles.

This which I haue is the third edition, & the fourth may be dailie expected, in regard the booke is so full of matter, I meane of corruption: Yet after the contents come once to be exactely discussed & discouered, I persuade my selfe it will quikly loose it vndeserued credit, & the dubtlesse if the leaues were larger it would ride poaste to Tobaconistis, & grossers shops.

I confesse Sir Humfrey I am Tom. Telltruth who cannot flatter or dissemble: yet may you,

assure

assure your selfe that altho' my speeche be ordinarily directed vnto your selfe, my intent is directly to reprooue those onelie who in their contriuing of the worke for you, & in your name, haue so profanely misapplyed, & abused sacred scriptures, ancient Fathers, & an number of other graue & Catholike authors so corruptedlie produced against their owne professed faith. Neyther yet haue I anie meaning by my words to offēde the dignitie of your person which I respect in the highest degree of desert, as neither the persons of those who truely are the authors of the worke, & haue deceiued both you & others: but rather with charitable S. Aug. I thinke to say of you & euery one of my aduersaries in religion: *Homo viuat, moriatur error*. Let the man liue, the error dye.

But now I will descend to particulars, & after due examine passe my sentence vpon euerie seuerall section, cheefelie insisting in discussion of the citations of the aduersarie, dedicating my whole censure not to the gentrie of my Countrie as Sir Humfrey doth, and of whose mature Iudgments I can not conceiue so basely as once to imagin they will be dangerouslie enamored with his booke, but I will cheefelie offer it to the more vulgar ranke of people who by reason of their smaler tallents may more easely be circumuented, whom if by conferring the one booke with the other I shall vnderstand they

come to be right informed of the trueth, I shall hould my ſelfe ſufficientlie rewarded by them as by thoſe whoſe wauering mindes I onely intend to rectifie by my labors, which otherwiſe for anie matter of ſubſtance I finde in the booke, I profeſſe I ſhould neuer haue eſteemed it worth the paines I haue taken in the confutation of it.

THE

A TABLE OF THE CONTENTS.

PERIOD 1.

THE proceeding of the Roman Church with the ſectaries cleared & defended from the iniurious impoſitions of the aduerſarie. Father Campian & other authors ill alledged. Where likewiſe the Romaniſts are freed from all cauſe of contention betweene themſelues & the pretended reformers, who are truelie the cauſe of all diſſention in the Church by there Preposterous pretended reformation.

PERIOD 2.

Neyther are there any corruptions in either faith or generally approued manners in the Roman Church. Nor anie want of care, & zeale in the Popes in procuring all neceſſarie reformation in the Church. But the aduerſaries abuſe of the Councels of Trent & Piſa, & his lyes & equiuocations diſcouered. His calumniations againſt Purgatorie, indulgences prayer to Saints reproued.

PERIOD 3.

No true Romaniſt euer renounced Poperie either in his liſe, or at his death: yet ſome formerly Romaniſts for deſire of licentious libertie, & other temporal motiues, haue apoſtated from the Catholike Ro-

Roman Church. Witnes, Luther, Caluin, & other founders of the misreformed Churches, to omit those of smaler note. Some cited for Romanists which are not such, with abuse of some other authors.

PERIOD 4.

An idle & calumnious discourse of the aduersarie foolishly affirming that the Roman Church is hinderd frō reformation by humane Police, reproued.

PERIOD 5.

The irrefragable argument of Catholikes that the pretensiue Reformers cannot assigne a time in which anie one point of the Roman faith was by anie publike authoritie before the dayes of Luther condemned for erroneous, maintained & fortified against the friuolous euasions of the aduersarie. Some Romanists by him impertinently alledged others cited for Romanists which are not such.

PERIOD 6.

The Catholike Roman doctrine cleared in it succession from all touche of heresie. But contrarily the pedegree of the misreformers much stained with the same where diuers ancient Fathers are abused & corrupted at the least in sense & meaning.

PERIOD 7.

The pretensiue reformed doctrine is not proued, eytherby testimonie of Romanists, or otherwise, to haue

eyther

eyther vniuersalitie or antiquitie, but conuinced to be quyte voyde of them both. And the aduersarie promissing to proue the antiquitie & vniuersallitie of his faith by testimonies of Romanists, onelie produceth two or three & in two or three onely points & yet those impertinent lie.

Period 8.

Neyther iustification by faith, nor the deniall of the reall presence or transubstantiation, or priuate Masse: not the dual number of Sacraments, not anie vnlawfulnes of communion in one kynde, of prayer or seruice in an vnknowne langue, of due honor of images or Indulgences proued by testimony of Romanists, or by anie other apparent argument: but all the aduersarie alledgeth is discouered to be faultie, friuolous, or forged.

Period 9.

Not one testimonie of Romanists for the certaintie of the pseudo-reformed faith, or vncertaintie of the Roman, as the aduersarie idlely pretended. But diuers of them abused & detorted.

Period 10.

No safetie, comfort, or benefit for the soule, but much for the bodie, in the pretensiue reformed faith: neyther did anie Romanists euer confesse more then this second parte of safetie, comforte, or benefit to be in the new Religion. Where diuers authors are depraued & abused by the false aduersarie.

It

PERIOD. 11.

It is conuinced to be absolutelie false, & calumnious that the Romanists eyther elude, or reiect the ancient Fathers, but contrarilie esteeme much more of them then anie of the misreformers euer did. Where diuers authors are falsely accused & abused.

PERIOD. 12.

No true recordes euer razed by the Romanists, but manie by the false reformers partelie razed, & partely exauthorized, or destroyed. With discouerie of some false dealing in the aduersarie.

PERIOD. 13.

It is a miere calumnious accusation of our malitious aduersarie to affirme that the Romanists blasphemie the scripture: where it is conuinced that the Romanists vse the scriptures with much more reuerence then the Nouellists doe. And diuers Catholikes are traduced & corrupted touching this matter.

PERIOD. 14.

It is miere phrensie to imagin that Bellarmine testifies the trueth of the misreformed doctrine eyther in the principal points of controuersie, or in anie other point of their newe tenets. And the same Cardinal is much abused by the aduersarie in this passage.

PE-

Period 15.

Ancient martyrs not pretended but defended to haue shed their blood not for defense of the newe pretended reformation, but in defense of the ancient Catholike & present Roman faith. And the weakenes and folie of the aduersarie discouered in his proceeding.

Period 16.

The Romanists haue no need to drawe any argument for proofe of their Religion from the confession of the sectaries. And to treate of this was impertinent to the aduersaries proiect.

Period 17.

It is demonstrated to be plainely false that the aduersarie hath proued by confessions of Romanists that his Religion is safer then theirs. And this is founded onely in his owne crasie iudgement fayling & miscarying in the verie foundation of his worke.

APPROBATIO.

VIso testimonio, cuiusdam viri docti mihique de fide & doctrina probè cogniti, quo testatur hanc Censuram cuiusdam libelli qui inscribitur *Viatuta*, nihil continere fidei vel bonismoribus aduersum sed multa Catholicæ religionis dogmata subtiliter explicata, orthodoxorumque scripta vindicata diligenter, Dignam censui quam & ego approbarem Duaci 28. Nouembr. 1632.

GEORGIVS COLVENERIVS
&c.

Correction of faultes, & supplie of omissions.

PAge 60. line 13. reade Church Apostacie. p. 114. l. 18. for them, reade it. p. 116. for be reade were. & for there formers reade the Reformers. p. 127. omit real presence. l. 134. for sainte reade smarte. p. 142. for to dissent reade not to consent. p. 154. for to such contrarie reade contratie to such & in the same page l. 23. for which is true, reade which in his opinion is true. & p. 155. touching the same matter. l. 15. for none of which is contrarie, reade none of which abstracting from the institution is contrarie. p. 145. for but hath, reade but since it & the rest were there included hath. pag. 156. line 2. for the manner reade the whole & intire manner. p. 158. for declaredly & vniuersally reade, so declaredly & vniuersally. page 226. for the worde of God, reade either the vnWritten worde of God, & in the same p. l. 14. adde althou' there were no other Councell for it. pag. 208. l. 20. to people, adde as euer so to receiue it by Christs commaunde. p. 265. for thrice, reade once. p. 240. lin. 6. to Christ, adde humane nature. p. 239. for reconciliatiõs, reade *reconciliationis*. p. 287. for dignitie reade *decorum*. p. 202. l. 7. omit other. l. 27. to exhibited add by it selfe. page 307. to not determined by the Church, adde in euerie particular. pag. 317. to illegitimate, adde concerning the doctrine of Images. p. 371. to diuine worship, add in spirit. pa. 447. l. 16. for in, reade since. pa. 463. for thim, reade him. & in the next l. 10. for may chalenge, reade may in that respect chalenge. p. 467. l. 17. adde in respecte of the people. p. 433. lin. 16. for able, reade agreable. & omit su. pag. 438. lin. 13. for to whome reade, & y et. p. 475. for conference reade cõfidence. p. 485. l. 16. for heresie, reade material heresie. p. 480. for martyrs reade examples. p. 493. l. 26. consequence. adde to this purpose. p. 566. l. 24. to soundes, adde including the prayers. p 546. l. 8. to glorious,

adde

tious, adde flashe. & l.26. for gaſpell, reade Goſpell. p.545.l.2.reade Pamphleter.p.421.l.18.omit in a viſible maner.

In the introduction to the Appendix.

Page 73.line 10. adde defined, l. 3.for falſe, reade ſafe.p.19.l.20.omit either, & in the next.l.reade workes.& l.24.to ſome of, adde them.

Beſides theſe neglects I aduertiſe the reader of an other faulte committed in the omiſſion of titles for the diſtinct matters. Neuertheleſſe this defect is ſufficiently ſupplied in regarde that in the commencement or entrance of euerie ſeuerall period, the contents are breefely declared. There be manie other errors of leſſe importance committed by the printer as being a ſtrãger as Nice with a great letter & the like, which the diſcretion and iudgement of the reader will eaſily correct. In like manner he will perdone the rudnes of the ſtyle as penned by one whoe by reaſon of his abſence & daylie conuerſation with ſtrangers ignoreth the propertie of his natiue language. As alſo he will conniue his tardance in the publication of the worke, which if it had not incountered vnimagined impediments might haue appeared manie monethes paſte.

THE FIRST PERIOD.

THis Period shall containe the first and second sections of S. Humfreys way, and I resolued to ioyne them together, by reason I finde litle matter of doctrine in them, as being rather in the nature of preamble or introduction, and consequently of too small substance for a scholler to insist vpon.

In his first section he purposed to prooue and disprooue the bitternesse of the Church of Roome towards the reformed Churches, but he bringeth verie little or nothing to that purpose, onely citing for his demonstration of the same some vnchristian speeches as he tearmeth them, vttered by father Campian in his first reason. *She tearmes vs* (saith S. Humfrey, meaning the Roman Church) *Heretiques, Hellhounds of Zwinglius, Luthers whelpes, Turkish Hugonotes, damned persons, and worse then Infidells*, which wordes if they weare truly related I must ne-

edes confesse include no small acrimony, but I hauing diligently read ouer on purpose Campians first reason, I finde not them all there, nay nor yet the greater part of them, nor any other equiualent vnto them. I finde indeede he speaketh sharpely against Luther and Caluin and he tearmeth them and others whom he citeth, heretiques for their mangling the holy scriptures according to their owne priuate Spirits, but he hath not one bitter worde against the persons of any sectaries of his owne Countrie, but onely iustly reprehendeth the Noueliſts in generall for rheir abuse of the worde of God. But suppose Father Campian had vsed such speeches indeede, what then? do not the reformers themselues most frequently both in their writings and pulpits vse farre worse tearmes both against the Romanists and the Roman Church, do not they accuse both her and her members of Idolatrie, Superstition, and Antichristianity, exaggerating matters with all the satyricall phrases they can inuent, as euen in this very place doth appeere where S. Humfrey himselfe rayling not onely against the particular members of the Roman Church, but also against her sacred selfe, charging her to haue lost her breasts or at least *to giue her children little or no sincere milke out of her two breasts, the two testaments*, and *that she doth dayly practise spirituall fornication*, and *that she hath plaid the*

Harlot

Quid ille nunc diceret, si viueret in terris, & Lutheros Caluinosque concerneret opifices Bibliorum, qui sua lima politula & elegantula, vetus nouumque testamentum esse raserint.

Quid Lutheri Carulis vt Tobiam, Ecclesiasticum, Machabæos, & horum odio com-

Harlot with a greate H. and finally taxing her *that she mainetayneth and practiseth manifest and manifould Idolatry*, and that *her title is vsurpation her deuotion is superstition*, and *she her selfe a professed enemy to the ghospell*; from whence you may inferre what a senceleſſe blindeneſſe this was in the knight, to dedicate the firſt chapter of his booke to the diſproouing of the bitternes of the Roman Church, he himſelfe hauing ſpent a greate parte of it in rayling againſt her, and alſo you may perceaue how importunely he accuſeth her of malignitie and want of deſire to quench *the vnquenchable broyles* of the Church as he tearmeth them, whileſt he himſelfe through his exaſperating ſpeches, aſmuch as in him lyeth, putteth no ſmall impediment to the extinguishing of the ſame, as the reader may plainely perceaue, and notwithſtanding he compareth the Roman Church and his owne to *two ſiſters* (which compariſon allthough it be very fond and abſurd in it ſelfe for that the true Church being but one onely ſpouſe of Chriſt, she can admitte no ſiſter nor Corriuall according to the meaning of the holy Spirit in the Cantieles affirming his ſpouſe to be one, (VNA ES SPONSA MEA) neuertheles he muſt needes be conuinced to haue proceeded moſt prepoſterouſly in this matter, and contrary to all reaſon, in that hee intending or at leaſt pretending to ſhew

plures a lios ea calumnia comprehenſos è ſyncero canone repente diſpungerent? &c. Quæ quidem Eccleſia cuſtos huius depoſiti non magiſtra (quod hæretici cauillantur) theſaurum hunc vniuerſum quem Synodus Tridentina eſt amplexa veteſtiſsimus olim concilij publicitus vendicauit. &c. Caſtatio myſticum illud Salomonis

there ought to be loue & vnion betwene them as betwene *two sisters descending from one and the same catholique and vniuersall mother* as he calleth her, yet as it were with one & the same, breath he accuseth the same Roman Church to haue beene the onely cause of separation; and carrieth the busines in such a rough and vncivill fashion towards her, giuing her such greate occasions of new disgusts, that it plainely appeereth he doth rather demonstrate his owne bitternesse & rancour towards her, then with any probable argument shew any such disposition to remaine in her against any such vnion as hee pretendeth to desire. Why then doth S. Humfrey complaine of that which is in a farre worse manner practised by himselfe and his owne brothers? besides this I pray you doth the supposed bitternesse of F. Cāpian proue the bitternesse of the Roman Church? could he alone bee the whole Roman Church who was but one onely member of it? Or are his speeches or priuate positions to be attributed to the whole Church, he being but one parte thereof and yet not the greatest? what a false *Metonymie* is this? if the head of the Church had vsed such speeches you would haue seemed to haue had some reason to haue attributed them to the whole, because that which the head doth may induce a denomination vppon the rest of the body, of which examples may be found e-

Canticum. &c. Nihilo pluris quam cantilenamed amicula & cum pediſſequis autor colloquium amatorium venereus furcifer ęſtimauit. Camp. rat. 1.

uen

uen in nature, but whatsoeuer any other member doth, it cannot rightly be attributed to the whole. So that we now see that in this allegation S. Humfrey himselfe doth so carrie the matter, and giueth the Church of Roome euen in this same section, so much occasion of new disgusts as besides the reheatsed calumnies taxing her *with creation of 12. new Articles and coyning of new expositions vpō the auld, farre different from the doctrine of the Apostles*, and that *she maynt aineth and practiseth manifest idolatry*. And the like most false and slanderous exprobrations, that as I said before, it plainely appeereth that he hath rather demonstrated his owne bitternes, and rancour towards the Roman Church, then shewed any such defect in her, by any argument drowen from Father Campians wordes by him produced, which wordes allthough by his quotation of Iewell in the margent he will seeme to haue taken them at secōd hand, yet certainely it is a plaine imposture, and so let them diuide it as they please betwixt themselues, it being euer supposed that S. Humfrey, and his Iewell, are of equall authoritie with the Catholiks, I meane of none at all. Moreouer S. Humfreys whole drift in this section being to cleere his owne Church from the infamous brand of Apostacy, he imposeth the whole cause of separation vpon the Roman Church, and produceth Eras-

mus for a wittnes of the ſame, *who being demaunded* (for ſooth) *of the duke of Saxonie what was Luthers* capitall offence *that ſtirred vp ſo many oppoſites againſt him, made anſwer that Luther had committed two greate crimes, for he had taken away the Crowne from the Pope, and had taken downe the belly of the monkes.*

To which ſaying of anſwer that Eraſmus is no competent wittnes againſt the Roman Church, eſpecially in a caſe where his ſole teſtimonie is interpoſed. *And if S. Humfrey* had ben circumſpect he would not haue cited Eraſmus his anſwere for this purpoſe, as containing one manifeſt lye if not two. For neither did Luther euer take the Crowne from the Pope, which as the world knowes, he ſtill enioyeth maugre him and all his adherents: neither did Luther euer take downe the bellies of the monkes, except it was by iniuſte vſurpation and rapin to fill his owne, and to leade his lyfe in luxurious concubinate with breach of his vowes to god and man.

Immediately before this momicall paſſage of Luther out of Eraſmus (which although S. Humfrey produced to colour the pretended Reformers diuiſiõ from the Church of Rome, yet doth it farre more ſtrongly argue a cauſe in the Pope iuſtely to reiect them, then anie excuſe of their prepoſterous ſeparation) before this I ſay he cited a place out of the Prophet

Oſe which becauſe it makes nothing to this purpoſe, but onely vpon his owne falſe ſuppoſition, that the Roman Church is wicked and idolatrous; therefore vntill I ſee him prooue his ſuppoſition, which yet I know he will neuer be able to performe, I leaue it as impertinent: as alſo I omit the examples he brings of Abrahams departure out of Caldea, and of the Iewes out of Egypt; which are as farre from the caſe we treate of, as Egypt is from Europe or Chriſtendome from Iewrye. Therefore I will onely giue notice to the reader how groſſely he abuſeth certaine authours he cytes, to teſtifye that by Babylon is meant the Chriſtian Rome. For ther is not one of thoſe authours that affirmes that after it was conuerted to the Chriſtian faith, it was called Babylon, according as the ſcripture vſually ſpeakes of Babylon either properly or Metaphorically. Neither is ther likewiſe anie of the ſame authours which teach, that ſince the conuerſion of that Citye to the faith of Chriſt, Chriſtians ought to departe from it, as out of a ſpirituall and idolatrous Babylon, which is that our aduerſarie here intendes to proue, or at the leaſt ought to proue, if anie thing he meanes to prooue againſt the Romaniſts. Cap. 4. 15. 17.

And to ſpeake firſt of the ancient authours here cyted by the kinght, which are Tertullia, S. Hierome, and S. Auguſtin, it is directly im-

possible that they should meane by Babylon, the Roman Church depraued by anie idolatrie of Christian people, for that they were all departed out of the world, before the supposed departure of the Roman Church from the true Religion, is affirmed by our newe sectaries to haue begun, which as they most commonly teach was not before the 600. yeare after the tyme of Christ our Sauiour.

Now as for the moderne authours to wit Orosius, Viues, Bellarmin, and Baronius, and Ribera, they are all knowne Romanists yea and some of them cheefe defendours of the Roman Church and faith, and so it is euident by this reason alone that they had not such a thought as to meane by Babylon the Roman
Cap. 22. Church. Viues vpon the 18. booke de cuit. Dei, explicates him selfe plainely saying: *Petrus Apostolus Romam Babylonem appellat, vt etiam Hyeronymus in vita Marci interpretatur, qui ad Marcellam scribens, non aliam existimat describi à Ioanne in Apocalypsi Babylonem, quam Vrbem Romam.* Bellarmin also speakes yet plainer in the verie place cited by S. Humfrey viz. lib. 2. de Rom. Pont. cap. 2. for he saith. *Respondeo Babylonem vocari non Romanam Ecclesiam sed Romanã vrbem, qualis erat Ioannis tempore.* Orosius I haue not. But let Baronius speake for
Baron. him selfe and others. *Nec per somnium quidem*
Adam. 45. *quis vnquam inuenit Romanam Ecclesiam esse Babylonis*

lonis nomine nuncupatam, ſed ipsã tantummodò uitatem; ac id quidem non ſemper, ſed cum impie- te referta aduerſus ipſam Eccleſiam bellum gere- . Ribera vnderſtands by Babylon perſe- uting Rome, not as it is nowe, I need not cite his wordes in a caſe ſo cleare. So that nowe I oe not ſee why S. Humfrey produced theſe uthors, except it were by corruption of them, make them precurſors of his corrupted ny.

And hence alſo the reader may gather how eakely the knight proceeds in this his firſt ection, which is the introduction to the reſt, regarde that by indeuouring to reprooue his aduerſarie, he doth vnaduiſedly prooue his wne imperfections, and ſo doubtleſſe he had eter beene idle thẽ ſo ill occupyed. And I ve- ly perſuade my ſelfe, that if the Archflamen ad duely examined the contents of this ſe- ion, he doubtleſſe would haue marked it ith a, *non imprimatur*.

In his ſecond ſection S. Humfrey pretends o prooue *the cauſe of contention betwixt the Re- man Church* and his owne, *originally to haue pro- ceded from the Romaniſts by their owne confeſ- ion.* Thus much he promiſeth in the title, but performeth nothing. For he cytes but three onely authours, that is, Caſſander, Camdẽ, and Ceſenas, in fauor of his poſition, and yet none of them are acknowledged by vs for ſounde

Roma-

Romaniſts, at the leaſt if we reſpect their wri-
tings here produced. And of Caſſander both
the inquiſitors in their Index, and Bellarmine in
his Controuerſies, ſufficiently declare the vn-
ſoundnes of his doctrine and religion. Cam-
den I hope is well knowe. Now for Ceſenas
notwithſtanding S. Humfrey ſtiles him Gene-
rall of the Franciſcans, as indeed once he was
though afterwards depoſed by his owne order
and excommunicated by Pope Iohn the 22
for his pertinacie and malapert manner of de-
fending, that the Fryes of his order could have
no rents or poſſeſſions, yet if he writ againſt
the Tyrannie of the Pope, as he is quoted by
the kinght, it is moſt manifeſt he could not be
a perfect Romaniſt: or at leaſt that worke
could not be his, as in truch I am perſuaded it
was not, but falſely fathered vpon him, through
the iniquitie of him who malitiouſly compo-
ſed *the myſterie of iniquitie*, againſt the Pope and
Roman Church. And hauing now examined
the matter I perceiue that which Ceſenas writ
or Ockam for him was not againſt the Popes
in generall: but he writ onely an epiſtle or trea-
tiſe (if anie thing he writ him ſelfe) againſt the
errors (as he termes them) of Pope Iohn in
particular, with whome he was much diſguſted
by reaſon of the foreſaid buſines and excom-
munications. And as for the wordes which
S. Humfrey cites touching two Churches, one

good

good, and an other euill, I fynde none ſuch, nor anie others to that ſenſe in Ceſenas. And if euer he vttered anie ſuch wordes, which according to his whole diſcourſe is wholely improbable, yet doubtleſſe he could not meane, that the euill Church was the Roman Church intirely and abſolutely, in regarde his owne wordes in his foreſaide worke doe euidently declare, that he ſubiected him ſelfe to the ſame euen in this ſame buſines, ſaying in his letters to the Generall Chapter of his Order: *Ad Sanctam Romanam Eccleſiam publicè & ſolemniter appellaui, & me & mihi adhærentes, & dicta noſtra ſuppoſui correctioni, & emendationi, & protectioni, & defenſioni ſanctæ Romanæ Eccleſiæ. Et ſum ſemper proteſtatus me illam fidem tenere & ſeruare velle perpetuo, quam tenet & ſeruat ſancta Romana Eccleſia, quæ eſt omnium Eccleſiarum mater & magiſtra.* So that this paſſage is a manifeſt impoſture either of S. Humfrey or Pleſſis chooſe them whether, who out of an vnſatiable deſire they haue to fynde out ſome track or ſtep, though neuer ſo obſcure, of their imaginarie Church before the dayes of Luther, care not what they forge or faine.

And yet more then this touching the ſmale authoritie which Ceſenas ought to haue, if he had done or ſpoken anie thing againſt the Roman Church, if S. Humfrey had looked well aboute him, or had beene carefull to knowe the

the truth, he migſt eaſily haue founde him regiſtred in the expurgatorie Index, euen in the firſt Claſſe for a prohibited authour. And ſo a man may iuſtely demaunde of our aduerſarie with what face then he can affirme his poſition to be confeſſed by the Romaniſts? Or what truth or ſinceritie can anie one imagin to be in him? and what credit can prudently be giuen by the Reader to the reſt of the allegations of his whole booke, who deales in this manner euen in the frontiſpice of his worke. And in truth I wonder that at the leaſt in humane policie, he was no more circumſpect, then to proſtitute his reputation ſo lauiſhly euen then, when he ought in reaſon to be moſt carefull of it. And now this may ſuffice for the cenſure of this ſecond ſection as conteyning nothing in particular wich deſerueth reherſall, or which may any wiſe redound, eyther to the authours credit, or ſerue for the confirmation of his tenets ſpecified in the former ſection, the proofe as you ſee being heere as weake and ſillie as the matter calumnious before, and conſequently deſeruing no milder ſentence of condemnation, then the contents of the former ſection.

The II. Period.

NOw I will paſſe to a view of the third ſectiō of Sir Humfreys booke which is, in effect a continuation of the ſame matter treated in the two firſt ſections, his chiefe drift being to shew the Pope and Roman Church to be in fault for refuſing reformation. And becauſe he perſiſteth in the ſame manner of proofe videlicet, *by the confeſſion of the members of the Roman Church*, I will examine briefly how exactly he proſecuteth the ſame, and whether he recouereth in this ſection the credit which he loſt in the former.

He laboureth to shew corruption both of faith and manners in the Church of Rome, and that by confeſſion of Roman Authours; and for the proofe of this confeſſion he produceth *Pope Alexander the fift out of the Councell of Piſa ſeſ. 20. the Councell of Senes, the Councell of Trent in diuerſe places. Moulin the 21. chap. of his Euchariſt. Agrippa de vanit. Scient. chap. 17. the Bull of Pius the 4. Philippus Mornæus. Card. Caraph. Conſill. de emendanda Eccleſia. Paulus Vergerius in opuſculis, & de Idolo Lauret. hiſt. of the Councell of Trent in English.*

Theſe

These are all the writers he alledgeth, which are ten in number. And although he citeth them all as if they were Romanists (for that he rehearseth them all to the same purpose and in one tenour or sequele of words) neuertheleſſe it is well knowen that fiue of the ten are ſo farre from being Romaniſts, as three of them are profeſſed enemies to the Roman Church, to wit *Moulin*, *Vergerius*, and *Mornæus*, and the other two that is *Agrippa*, and the *Tridentine* hiſtory in English, are of no authority, nor credit amongſt the Romaniſts, as being either plaine heretikes, or ſuſpected of hereſie. And as for the other fiue Catholike teſtimonies, they containe not one word whereby it may be proued that either the Pope, or the reſt, of the Roman Church did refuſe to admite of due reformation, as Sir Humfrey affirmeth, but the contrary is moſt manifeſt out of the Councell of Trent it ſelfe, euen in the ſame places which he citeth, where ſpeciall decrees of diuerſe particular abuſes to be reformed by the Paſtors of the Church are extant. True it is that where abuſes are decreede to be reformed, thoſe ſame abuſes are of neceſſity ſuppoſed to be, either in times paſt, preſent, or future, and ſo farre I graunt the teſtimonies cited by the K. out of the two Councels and other Catholike Authors be of force: but to prooue that thoſe abuſes be corruptiõs in faith, or yet in manners,

except

except we meane of the euill faith and mãners brought into the Church by Luther & his followers) or that they being truly knowen to be in the Church, yet the Pope will not haue them reformed, this I say is a meere calumniation diuised by Sir Humfrey in disgrace of the chiefe Pastour of the Roman Church, and cannot possiblie be deduced out of the foresaid testimonies, but rather the quite contrary is expressely to be found, and lastely in the decrees of the Tridentine Councell, as we haue already said. That which Sir Humfrey affirmeth in the beginning of his 20. page, is conuinced to be a manifest vntruth, to wit *that the day of the Roman reformation is not yet come*. And although the Knight out of the aboundance of his wit, is not content onely to saye that the Romanists confesse there are corruptions in their Church onely in manners, but alsoe, that they confesse the same in doctrine: neuertheless of the poynt of doctrine he bringeth not any proofe at all, eyther out of Romanists, or any other waye, but insteede of proofes he vttereth diuers vntruths, mingled with some impertinences and equiuocations. Hee telleth his reader in the 20. page that *the Councell of Trent, in Paul the thirds time, complained of Indulgences*, but this is most false, for the Councell doth not in anie sorte complaine of the Indulgences them selues, but onely that the Popes officers

Decret. de Refor.

officers in collecting the almes or contribution of the people vppon the graunt and gayning of them, gaue scandall to faithfull Christians, as appeareth by the very same wordes which he himselfe citeth, among which there is not any one repugnant to the doctrine of Indulgences but onely to the abuses of the questours; as also the same wordes cited in Sir Humfreys margent in lattin, do yet more plainely declare, so that this is no lesse then an inexcusable falsitie vttered by the knight for want of an argument, as it seemes, to prooue corruptions in doctrine in the Roman Church. Another vntruth he hath in the 22. pa. where he saith thus; *neither did those men* (meaning the Fathers of the Councell of Trent) *seeke a reformation in manners onely, but in the doctrine it selfe.* Whereas they in that very place by the knight alledged, wish onely that the priuate masse might be restored to the auncient custome of the communion of the people, together with the priest, which as you knowe is no matter of doctrine in cõtrouersie betweene the Romanists and the reformers, but onely of practise, and consequently it proueth not the knights intent in this place, but rather his ignorant mistaking of the true state of the question in that pointe of controuersie about priuate masse. Now that which he addeth of the Latin seruice in the Roman Church to wit that

Vide Con. Trid. sess. 21. cap. 9.

the

the Councell commaunds all Paſtours that they at the Maſſe doe frequently interpret and declare vnto the people the miſtery of the Sacrament, who doth not ſee how impertinent it is to the matter of doctrine, and how vnapt a medium it is to proue that the Doctours of the Councell either did ſeeke reformation in the ſame, or to shew *how neare the ſame doctours came to the doctrine of the reformed Churches*, as he preſently addeth, affirming them ſo to doe, ſince the Councell proceedeth not there, by way of definition or decree in matter of doctrine, but onely by way of ordinance and cōmaund as the wordes by him ſelfe rehearſed doe plainely ſpecifie; & yet not ſo but that the ſame Councell, and in the ſame place doth either expreſſely commaund, or at the leaſt ſuppoſe that the Maſſe ought to be for the moſt part celebrated in the lattin tongue.

Moreouer touching equiuocations, certaine it is that he doth equiuocate in his allegation of *Pope Alexander* out of the Councell of *Piſa*, where he ſaith that *the Pope promiſed ſolemnely to intend the reformation of the Church*, whereas in truth Alexander meaneth not of the faith of the Romā Church, as the knight would haue it, but of the reformation of manners, or of ſome abuſes practized in the Church by particular perſons. Beſides this, it is not probable that the Pope would meddle himſelfe in mat-

ters of doctrine in ſuch a Councell as was aſſembled purpoſely for the taking away of a *ſchiſme*. But cõcerning manners I finde that in the laſte period of the ſame Councell of Piſa which Sir Humfrey cites ther is expreſſe mention both of ſome reformatiõ already made by the Pope & Cardinals,& alſo of more referred to the next generall Sinod: the words of which determination are theſe. *Item cum Dominus noſter Papa cum conſilio Concilij intenderet reformare Eccleſiam in capite & membris, & iam multa per Dei gratiam ſint expedita per ipſum Dominum noſtrum Papam*, moreouer in the ſame Councell of Senes which the knight alſo here produceth I finde no mention of corruption in faith except by faith Sir Humfrey will vnderſtand the corrupted faith of the wicleſiſts, Huſſits,or the Grecians, the reformation and reduction of all which both the Pope and Councell indeuored ſo farre to effect and compaſſe,as they declared the firſt two ſectaries to be heretikes and that ſo earneſtly as they threatened all thoſe with excommunication who should any way fauore them euen with as much onely as to giue them ſalte to their pottage,& as for reformatiõ of manners there is not a word which proueth that the Pope made anie reſiſtance therein but rather expreſſely laboured for the ſame, tho by accident of impediments incident it was actually hindered at that preſent. *Sacroſancta*

Synodus

Synodus vniuerſalem Eccleſ. repreſentans nuntijs ſanctiſſimi in Chriſto Patris ac Domini noſtri Martini quinti ſummi Pontif. ſpecialiter deputatis ipſius reformationem intentus, incipiens à fidei fundamentō præter quod nemo poteſt aliud ponere damnationem hæreſum Wicleſiſtarum & Huſſitarum ſuorumque ſequacium &c. In decret. Cōtra Huſſitas hæreticos. Con. Sen. By which it is manifeſt how great the impudencie of Sir Hunfrey is in alledging theſe two Councels to proue want of reformation in the Pope or Roman Church they ſtanding both ſo plainely for the contrary to his poſitiō or rather impoſitiō. He equiuocateth alſo in that allegation of *Card. Schomberg* whom he affirmeth to haue *oppoſed the reformation* made in the Councell of Trent. Whereas yet he citeth no wordes of the Card. but onely a bare relation taken out of a certaine hiſtory of the acts of the Coūcell published in English touching the foreſaid Cardinals oppoſitiō or rather propoſition onely, in the point of reformation. Which fact being related onely by an vnauthēticall hiſtory, the allegation can be of no more authority thēis the relatour himſelfe who was then a Caluiniā ſectary called *Suauis* who hath writ a very corrupted narration of that which paſſed in the Coūcell as relating the cōtentions or cōtrary opiniōs which the Fathers & Doctours held whiles matters were in debate & vnconcluded, as if they had continued after

the definitions and decrees were made, and ſo abuſing both the Councell & his reader egregiouſly. And yet more then this ſuppoſe the relation were moſt true and authenticall, yet doth it not proue Sir Humfreys intent, videlicet that the Pope denieth reformation of Corruptions in faith and manners, for that in the wordes related out of the foreſaid hiſtory, there is no mention of any corruptions of that nature, but onely of abuſes in generall tearmes, which Schomberg was of opinion that it had beene better to let them alone, yet that was onely his particular dictamen and propoſition, to which neither the Pope nor the reſt of the Councell agreed, but reſolued, vpon a courſe of reformation as the decrees themſelues doe teſtifie: ſo that this paſſage of the related hiſtorie is impertinentlie alledged by the Knight.

Finally S. Humfrey doth equiuocate not onely in that which we haue ſaid, but alſoe in the very ſubſtance of this his whole ſection. For his cheefe or rather whole ſcope being not onely to proue corruptions in doctrine and manners to be confeſſed by the Romaniſts to be in their Church, but alſo that the Pope refuſeth to take them away, he by his allegations of the teſtimonies of ſome Romaniſts proueth in parte that there were corruptions in manners both before and when the Councell of

Trent

Trent was assembled, but he quite dissembleth the other parte, to witte, that they were reformed allso by the same Councell; and yet not withstanding the very same places which he produceth out of the Romanists doe as plainely auerre the one as the other. And so out of those proceedings of Sir Humfrey and the rest which hath bene said it may plainely appeere that he is so farre from recouery of that honour which he lost in the former sections, that he hath now stained the same not a little more, and so we may conclude this section and include it in the former censure.

The III. Period.

IN the fourth section the knight proceedeth to greater matters, to matters I say of life and death; for he affirmeth that manny *learned Romanists conuicted by the euidence of truth either in parte or in whole haue renounced Popery before their death*, But let vs see how exactly and sollidly he proceedeth in so weightie a matter.

He citeth *the Councell of Basill out of Genebrard. Aeneas Syluius out of Platina. Harding out of Iewell. The Rhemish testament out of Cansabon. The lord Cooke. B. Gard. out of Iohn Fox. Bellarmins Controuersies. And his last will or testament.*

Medicinæ celeberrimus professor D. Venerandus Gablerus,

ſtament. *Albertus Pighius. Paulus Vergerius and his brother Baptiſt.* Theſe are all the authours hee citeth in this ſection. For the proofe of his vaſt aſſertion, which authours being but ten in number yet three of them are knowen to be no Romaniſts except he will haue L. *Cooke* and the *two brother Bishops* to be Romaniſts, which neuertheleſſe he confeſſeth to *to haue proteſted againſt the Romish doctrine*; ſo that now according to his owne confeſſion the whole number of Roman authours he citeth heere is reduced to ſeuen, which ſmall number I cãnot imagin according to what Arithmetick it can truly be accounted many, eſpecially if we compare them to the infinite number of the Romaniſts which haue bene & yet are extant in the Chriſtian world conſtant maintainers of Popery. And this I ſay euen in caſe it were true that all thoſe ſeuen had euer renounced the Romish faith either in part or totally, as the knight affirmeth; which neuertheleſſe I will make apparent to be otherwiſe.

And firſt touching the Councell of Baſil, the very ſame wordes which Sir Humfrey citeth do conuince the ſame, for ſaith hee the Councell *did allow the cup to the Bohemians vpon this condition: that they ſhould not find fault with the contrary vſe, nor ſeuer themſelues from the Catholike Church*. Now what is heere to be found in theſe wordes of the Councell which

tanti comitis exemplum ſecutus redijt ad Catholiciſmum. Adfuerat is Petro Paulo vergerio è corpore migranti apud quem minor quadam videbatur perfregiſſe vt non modo Catholicus ſed pientiſſimus quoque Catholicus fieret. Sane aiunt viri graues hunc Apoſtatam Vergerium ſub mortem teterrimos exhalaſſe fatores ac bouis inſtar horrendos

is any kinde of renuntiation of the Romish faith? nay what is there which concerneth the Romish faith at all? that which the Councell determineth being but onelie a graunt to one particular nation vpon particular reasons, and that in a point of practice not of doctrine, which also, if our English protestants were as conformable to the Roman Church in all other points of faith and manners as the Bohemians then were, might perhaps vpon the like iust reasons and vpon the same condition be graunted in the realme of England, and that without any preiudice to either faith or manners. But our English sectaries are so farre from conformitie to the Romanists not onely in diuerse other points but euen in this particular that they cõtinually exclaime against them both in their bookes and sermons as violatours of Christs institution in that they do not allwayes and in euerie countrie communicate the people in both kindes, accusing them also that they mangle the Sacrament and vniustlie depriue the laytie of one part there of, iudging the same for a laufull cause, at the least in parte, of their separation from the Roman Church, none of which particulars are proued by the testimonie of the Councell of Basil to haue concurred in the case of the Bohemians, but rather the contrarie is most plainelie specified: so that the knight hath laboured in vaine or

edidisse boatus &c. anno 1567. Suius Com. pag. 733.

Con. Basil. lienſe initio legitimum postea Conciliabulum Scismaticum, & nullius authoritetis. Con.

Sat. sess. 21. ex Bell. non refero verba.

rather against himselfe by producing the foresaid testimonie, of the Councell of Basil in which noe renuntiation of Popery is to be founde nor anie agreement in doctrine or manners with the pretensiue reformed Churches. From whence it is also consequentlie inferred that to be clearelie false which our aduersarie affirmes in the beginning of this section, to wit that *the reformed Churches haue done nothing in this otherwise then former Councels had anciently decreed.*

He citeth in the second place *Aeneas Syluius*, who was afterwardes Pope Pius the second, as if he had renounced the Romish religion in that he saith, *that as marriage vpon weightie reasons was taken from the Priests, so vpon weightie reasons it were wished to be restored.* But what is this to the purpose? is a wish of an alteration in one particular point, & that not in faith but manners or rather in practice of the Church a renuntiation of religion either in parte or in whole? or is the prohibition of marriage, or the celibate or single life of priests anie of the twelue articles which the knight is pleased to tearme the new creede of the Roman Church? no suerlie. How then is it a matter of faith, or the renunciation of it the renuntiation of Poperie? and not rather a renuntiation onelie of a precept of the Church in case it were truelie renounced by anie Romanist whatsoeuer

ſoeuer he is. Which renuntiation neuertheleſſe was neuer made by the authour cited as his wordes rehearſed out of Platina by Sir Humfrey himſelfe doe make manifeſt to anie ſyncere and vnpartiall reader. In which not by way of wish or as giuing his reall aſſent with the reformers as Sir Humfrey doth corruptedly relate, but onelie by a doutfull deliuerie of his owne priuate dictamen that preſent tyme occurring vnto him. *Sacerdotibus magna ratione ſublatas nuptias, maiori reſtituendas videri.* Plat. in pio 2. And yet more then that after he was Pope and making reflection vpon his former writings published in his greener yeares, to the imitation of S. Auguſtin and others he framed are tractation of diuers particulars paſſages of his owne workes among which this is one, as appeares by the tenor of the ſame which in his later editions in force of a breefe or Bull is vſually prefixed to his bookes. To omitte that if the foreſaid *Syluius* had bene a renouncer of anie point of Poperie it were too ridiculous to imagin that euer he would haue bene elected Pope, as neuertheleſſe the knight confeſſeth him to haue bene afterwardes. And thus the reader may plainelie ſee that this allegation is of no more force then the former towards the proofe of Sir Humfreys intent.

In

In the next place is maſter *Harding* brought in for a renoncer of Popery. For that as I ewell reporteth, he ſaith that *godly and faithfull people haue ſince the time of the Primitiue Church much complained of Priuate Maſſe.* But ſuppoſe it were true, what is this to the purpoſe of renouncing of Popery? For what zealous and religious Papiſt is there in the world who doth not iuſtly complaine of want of deuotiō in the laity for that they haue not that feruour in frequenting the communion which thoſe of the Primitiue Church had? and if this could be remedied what Romaniſt would not much deſire it, yea and by all meanes poſſible procure it? but is this to condemne as vnlawfull or contrary to Chriſts inſtitution (as you ſectaries doe) all Maſſes as be celebrated without Cōmunicants? no ſuch matter. No more, nay much leſſe then if for complaining that Sir Humfrey Linde doth not deale ſo ſincerely in the citations of his aduerſaries as becometh the reputatiō of a knight, a man ſhould therefore preſently be thought to haue quite condemned him of diſhoneſt proceeding in that nature euen in the higheſt degree of falſe dealing and corruption. Which collection if he pleaſe to graunt, I know not who will be ſo vnciuill as to contradict him. Eſpeciallie conſidering that euen in this verie citation he hath corrupted doctour Harding moſt vnconſcionablie

nablie by applying againſt priuate maſſe that which he ſpeakes onelie againſt the negligence of the laye people for that they ſo commonlie omit to communicate at maſſe, as if that authour diſalowed of the priuate maſſe it ſelfe, whoſe wordes neuertheleſſe truelie cited as he hath them in the beginning of the ninth leafe of his anſwer to Iewels chalēge will cleare the buſines and manifeſtlie diſcouer where the fault lyeth: *that others do commonlie forbeare ſaith hee, to communicate with the preiſt it is through their owne faulte and negligence not regarding their owne ſaluation whereof the godly and carefull rulers of faithfull people haue ſince the tyme of the primitiue Church allwayes much complained.* And thus you ſee how nimblie the ſubtil knight hath abuſed both that worthy doctour & his owne reader. Wherefore it being by this which we haue ſaid apparent that *M. Harding* was no condemner of priuate maſſe as either vnlawfull or againſt the inſtitution of Chriſt, it alſo is thence manifeſtlie conſequent that he was no renouncer of Poperie euen in that particular point, and ſo the proofe which the knight would draw from him is of no force, nor auaileable to his cauſe; nay it is in trueth ſo diſagreeable to the ſtate of the queſtion that it is no ſmall wonder how either mallice or ignorance could ſo much blinde him as to make vſe of it in this matter.

The

The fourth reſtimonie is out of the *Rhemes Teſtament* the authours of which (as hee affirmeth out of Cauſabon) auouch the ſcriptures to *haue bene tranſlated into English by the importunitie of the heretiks*. And he addeth *that the Romaniſts haue of late graunted a diſpenſation to ſome men and woemen alſo to reade ſcriptures, and this* alſo *was done* (ſaith hee) *by the importunitie of the heretiks*. Moreouer as it were in confirmation of the ſame, he addeth that *moſt of the Romiſh proſelites*, (as he tearmeth them) *did frequent their Church and ſeruice for the firſt eleuen yeeres of Queene Elizabeth: neither* (ſaith he) *was it forbidden by any lawfull councell*. Thus he diſcourſeth touching this point.

Heere is much a doe and little to the purpoſe. And indeede after a greate deale of ſtudie a man ſhall hardlie collect anie thing out of the whole diſcourſe which may ſeeme to haue anie shewe of proofe for the knights aſſertion, videlicet. *That many Romaniſts haue renounced Popery before their death*. Yet it ſeemes to me, his whole drift may be reduced to theſe two arguments. The firſt thus: The Romaniſts haue tranſlated the bible by the importunitie of the reformers, & giue diſpenſations to ſome men and woemen to reade it; therefore many Romaniſts haue renounced Popery. The ſecond thus: moſt of the Romaniſts did frequent the reformed Church and ſeruice for the firſt

11. yeeres of Queene Elizabeths reigne, neither was their communication with them prohibited by anie lawfull Councell, therefore manie Romanists renounced Popery before their death.

Loe heere two learned Enthymems: they march like two march hares and runne starke wilde. I wonder what nimble vniuersity man hath taught the knight to choppe Logike so minshingly, or what polipracticall Alchymist hath instructed him in the art of extraction so exactly, that out of the importunity of his reformed consorts, he is able to drawe the translation of the Rhemish Testament, and that with a dispensation for some men and woe men to reade it. So skilfull he is in extracting oyle out of stones and milke out of mountaines. Neither doth his exquisite knowledge stay heere, but he will needes persuade his reader he can extract also out of the same, that *many Romanists haue renounced their* Popery by translating the Bible into English and by giuing a dispensation to reade the same; nay and that which is yet more maruelous he seemeth to glory not a little that this hath beene all effected by the importunity of his reformed brothers; as if forsooth, they had exercised an act of some heroycall virtue therein. Whereas in truth, importunity is so farre from desert of commendation as it may

be

be much more iuſtly regiſtred in the liſt of vices then of virtues: and ſoe we ſee that in the Scripture it ſelfe the importunitie of a beggar is branded with the marke of improbity, that which I maruell, the knight being ſo greate a Bibliſt as he is, did not reflect vpon it. And admitte it were true that the Romaniſts moued by the importunity of the ſectaries did tranſlate the Bible into the vulgar tongue for the laitie to reade, by what rule of Logike I pray you Sir Humfrey doth it follow that many Romaniſts haue renoūced Popery before their death? proue but this one conſequence and I yeeld you the victory. And pray tell me what article of faith is that which teacheth the Romaniſts to beleeue that the Bible ought not to be read by the laytie in no caſe, or vpon no reaſons neuer ſo weighty? or if you can finde no ſuch article, as I know you cannot, then confeſſe you haue loſt the victory in the point, confeſſe you haue proceeded weakely, confeſſe you haue by your firſt argument proued nothing: and ſo I will take that for graunted, and paſſe to the ſecond, which allthough it hath ſome more ſenſe in it then the other, yet it is ſenſeleſſe enough as ſhall preſently appeare. For that being to proue your antecedent or firſt propoſition you onelie produce *L. Cookes report, that moſt of the Romiſh proſelytes did frequent*

quent

quent your Church or ſeruice for the firſt eleuen yeares of Queene Elizabeth. But you muſt knowe that this authour is no competent witneſſe againſt the Romaniſts, he is one of your owne crue, we care not for his reportes, we leaue them to the lawyers: He indeed (as you do now) preſumed to write matters of diuinity, but in that he plaied the *Sutor vltra crepidam*, as you doe, and ſo laboured onely to make him ſelfe ridiculous, as you doe. But let vs admit that which he reporteth, to be true, and that ſome frequented your Church and ſeruice in thoſe times (as I my ſelfe haue heard they did at the leaſt in exteriour shewe, yet priuately at home frequenting Maſſe alſo,) doth it thence follow that in their minds they renounced Popery? no ſuch matter. No more then doe diuerſe of his maieſties ſubiects, who euen at this day goe to your Churches, whom neuertheleſſe you your ſelues hould for none of yours: but therefore doe commonly terme them *Church going Papiſts*. So that according to this and euen *ad hominem*, that is, vpon your owne Principles, your ſequel is to be condemned to be of noe force; or at the moſt out of that fact of thoſe Romaniſts which you ſpeake of, it can onely be inferred that they proceeded contrary to the profeſſion of their faith, but not that they renounced the ſame, which two things if you could haue duely diſtinguiſhed, I

verily

verily perſuade my ſelfe you would neuer haue diſcourſed ſofriuoluſlie as you doe in this point. But now I greeue I haue ſpent ſo much time in ventilating ſo largelie ſuch chaffie ſtuffe.

After this wiſe diſcourſe Sir Humfrey paſſeth to his owne perſuaſions, for the proofe of his aſſertion. *I am verily perſuaded* (ſaith he) *that many at this day in the Church of Rome doe aſſent to our doctrine that dare not communicate with vs openly in the Church;* adding an appeale to their conſciences how many of the Romaniſts haue renounced Popery in thoſe diuerſe points in this place. But to this I anſwer that if Romaniſts would haue bene perſuaded by this wiſe knights motiues they had lõge ago all renounced Poperie and turned Puritans indeed, but God be praiſed they neuer were, nor I hope euer will be perſuaded by him and his workes, if they haue anie branies in their heads. No ſuerlie. And if they come but once to examine this his booke and get a view of the diſcouerie of his deceipts, they will be ſo farre from being moued either by his reaſons or by his authority to relinquish their owne faith, that doubtleſſe they will rather be quite out of loue both with him & his religion. And euen in this particular perſuaſion of his he ſheweth himſelfe ſo ridiculous as no man of iudgment if he marke his proceeding can euer eſteeme him as a man worthy either to be

heard

heard or followed. For what man in the world willbe moued by him who in ſteede of proofes bringeth his owne perſuaſions onely of the teſtimonie of the conſcience of thoſe whom he houlds for aduerſaries, and whoſe conſciences if he proceedes conſequently, he muſt either hould for bad, or at the leaſt for vnknowne to himſelfe. What is this but *abſurdum per abſurdius*? and yet he is ſo confident in this his vaine perſuaſion that he cometh to ſpecifie diuerſe points of Popery which he affirmeth to haue beene renounced by many Romaniſts, ſome of which pointes are no Poperie at all, but either his owne lies, or els his ignorant miſtake of the true doctrine of Papiſts in thoſe particulars.

For example in his page 32. he demaundeth of vs how many Romaniſts *doe ſmile at fained miracles, at diuine vertue aſcribed to medals, beades, Agnus deis, and the like* which ſaying of his is meerely grounded vpon a falſe ſuppoſition or rather a ſlanderous falſitie of his owne coyning, as if it were true that the Romaniſts in generall did both approue falſe miracles, and hould diuine vertue to be in medals, beades, and Agnus deis: neither of which is true or was euer defended by any Romaniſt in the world, it being both true and manifeſtlie knowen that though all Romaniſts hould the foreſaid things for holie, and do aſſure themſelues that God doth ſometimes pleaſe to worke ſtrange ef-

feats by them, yet do not they beleeue that any diuine vertue doth reſide in them, no more then they hould to haue reſided in the ſhadowe of S. *Peter* which neuertheleſſe wrought ſtrange and miraculous effects. So that by this diſcourſe Sir Humfrey doth onelie proue his owne ignorance and malice, as alſo he doth moſt manifeſtlie in the next lines, and that more ſubtillie then before, where he demaundeth *how many* (*Romaniſts*) *do prefcrre the lawfulneſſe of Prieſts mariage before the keeping of a concubine; although* ſaith hee, *the contrarie be the common doctrine of the Church of Rome*? In which wordes he doth indeauour craftilie to inſinuate to his reader that it is a poynt of Poperie, and that the Roman Church doth approoue the keeping of a Concubine by a Prieſt rather then he ſhould marrye, whereas the Church doth not in anie caſe allowe eyther of the one or the other; but onelie houldes that, that Prieſt offendeth God more grieuouſlie who matrieth to wit after his preiſthood and vowe of chaſtitie, then he who keepeth a concubine at home, as Coſterus though incompletlie cited and vniuſtlie taxed by the knigth, doth moſt truelie affirme. And this is a certaine knowen trueth among diuines conſequent to the prohibition of Prieſts mariage which prohibition once ſuppoſed he that ſhould marrie ſhould not onelie committe

Sacerdos ſi fornicetur aut domi concubinam foueat, tamen etſi graui ſacrilegio ſeſe obſtringat: grauius tamen

mitte a ſcandalous ſinne of the flesh, as that Prieſt doth who should be a Concubinarie, but alſo he should in that caſe comit a Speciall irreuerence againſt the Sacrament of marriage by his ſacrilegious fruſtration of the ſame which ſacrilegious action and violation of his now is of it ſelfe a more grieuous ſinne then is the keepinge of a concubine, as all men, except the reformed brothers, doe eaſilie apprehend, conformable to which S. Aug. ſaith that mariage after a vowe of continencie is worſe then adulterie. *To omit*, that for a Preiſt to marrie in that manner beſides the foreſaid crimes it includes alſo the ſcandall of Concubinate it ſelfe.

peccat ſi contrahat matrimonium. &c. Coſterus. Enchir. cap. 17. de calib. prop. 9.

Aug. de bono vide cap. 11.

Planè non dubitauerim dicere lapſus & ruinas à caſtitate ſanctiore quæ nouetur Deo, adulterijs eſſe peiores. ibidem.

But now Sir Humfrey for concluſion of his former diſcourſe paſſeth to the poynt of merits. *Laſtly* (ſaith hee) *how many for feare of vaine glorie and preſumption and by reaſon of the vncertainetie of their owne workes doe relie wholie vpon the merits of Chriſt Ieſus? ſhewe me that learned man that liueth a profeſſed Papiſt in the Church of Rome and dyeth not a ſounde Proteſtant in this prime foundation of our faith*. Thus the knigth; who as you may eaſilie perceiue by way of a glorious Epiphonema goeth about to perſwade his reader that all the learned Romaniſts before their death renounce that article of the Roman Church which affirmeth that a man iuſtified by the grace of God can merit the Kingdome of heauen by the good workes

he doth by vertue of the grace of God and merits of Ieſus Chriſt, becauſe forſooth, *many for feare of vaine glorie and preſumption, and by reaſon of the vncertainelie of their owne workes at their* death doe relie wholie on the merits of their Sauiour; whereas indeede theſe are two farre different poynts of doctrine, the firſt, that is, the trueth of mans merit in the ſenſe declared being a matter of faith in the Roman Church; the ſecond which is the confidence in merits, being none; the one being about the ſubſtance of merits, the other onelie about the qualitie; the one about the abſolute acknowledgment of merits, the other onely about the ouergreate confidence or preſumption in them: And ſo he that renounceth the firſt, renounceth Poperie indeede, but he that renounceth the ſecond doth not; neither can he be called a Proteſtant as the knight would haue him to be, for the onelie deniall of confidence in merits, as in it ſelfe it is moſt manifeſt. By all which, becauſe Sir Hũfrey with all his diuinitie had not iudgement to diſtinguish, he proueth nothing but doth onelie hallucinate betweene trueth and falſehood. Neither doth the example of *B. Gardiner* which he alledgeth anie whit auaile his cauſe; for ſuppoſe that be true which he affirmeth of him, to wit, that in *his ſickneſs he ſet the merits of Chriſt in the gap to ſtand betwixt Gods Iudgment & his owne ſinnes*, yet cãnot he thence

inferre

inferre that therefore the Bishop renounced the trueth of the doctrine of merits in generall, nay not his owne merits in particular, but onelie the presumption of them, or the confidence in them by reason of the vncertainetie of them, as I haue alreadie declared. Besides that, this which he is affirmed to say of himselfe being but onelie a relation of *Fox*, we may iustlie doubt of the trueth of it. For he hath bene long since hunted to his hole by a learned Catholike and his vnright Reuerence manifestlie conuinced to be a Father of lyes.

Wherefore he is of no credit with vs: neither can his testimonie preuaile against vs. We care not for him, his acts and monuments are of no moment among vs, his testimonie is not the cõfessiõ of a Romanist which is that our aduersary promised in the title of his booke, and we expect he should performe: and to omit the smale credit which I and all Catholikes giue to the relations of Master Fox, yet I fynde that he who hath dealt so falsely with others, hath now founde one of his owne profession who dealt not verie sincerelie with him in recounting out of his relation the passage of B. Gardiner at his death, for whereas Sir Humfrey will needs proue by the testimonie of Fox, that this Bishop renounced Poperie at his death in the pointe of merits: yet Fox in his 2622. page onelie saith thus: *That according to the reporte of*

one whome he will not name (perhaps he could not) *when D. Day Bishop of Chicheſter came to him and began to conforte him* (great comfort I warant you) *with wordes of Gods promiſſe and free iuſtification in the blood of Chriſt our Sauiour repeating the ſcriptures to him. Wincheſter hearing that. What my lord, quoth he, will you open that gap now, then farewell altogether: to mee and ſuch other in my caſe you may ſpeake it, but if you open this window vnto the people then fare well all.*

And now according to this ſpeech of B. Gardiner let the iudicious reader imagin if he can how Sir Humfrey can poſſibly gather that he renowced Poprietie and that a wiſer man will not rather collect the contrarie: to wit that altho' dayes wordes might be vttered to him & others of learning and vnderſtanding without danger of peruerſion, but not perhaps to the cõmon people who by their ignorance and frayletie might eaſilie miſinterpret them (as he did that vttered them) and ſo eaſilie receiue harme by them not withſtãding that they of themſelues in a founde ſenſe include nothing but truth.

The knight alſo citeth to the ſame purpoſe (yet to no purpoſe) *Bellarmine in his ſixte booke of Iuſtif. 7. chap. and his teſtament or laſt will.* Saying in the firſt place that *it is the ſafeſt way to rely wholy on the merits of Chriſt Ieſus.* But this according to that which hath bene already ſaid of this matter, is at the

moſt

moſt but onelie a renuntiation of preſumption or ouermuch confidence in our owne vncertaine merits, as is moſt apparent out of *Bellarmines* owne doctrine euen in the verie ſame chapter where the wordes cited by Sir Humfrey are found thoug much otherwiſe then by him they are related as afterwardes I will declare. Now in the ſecond place, the wordes are theſe. *I beſeech him* (that is God) ſaith Bellar. *that he would admitte me into the companie of his Saints and elect, not as a valluer of merits, but as a giuer of mercie*; which wordes, if the knigth had not bene ouermuch diſtracted, he would eaſilie haue perceiued that they fauour his intent nothing at all, as not cõteyning any kinde of renuntiation of the due eſtimation of merits in themſelues, but onelie ſignifie a certaine negatiue renuntiation of confidence in his owne particular deſerts at the hands of God, which is both moſt conformable to the ſame moſt learned and virtuous Cardinalls owne doctrine in his booke of Iuſtification before cited, and alſo moſt pious in it ſelfe. But it ſeemes our learned Knigth, was either ignorantlie or malitiouſlie deceiued in the true meaning of *Bellarmines* wordes, imagining verie ſillilie, that becauſe the Cardinall at his death prayed God to receiue him into glorie, not as a valuer of merits, he had held God for no valuer of merits at all, whereas God knowes, the pious

Prelate had no ſuch meaning; neither doe his wordes rightlie cõſtrued, carrye anie ſuch ſenſe rather doe expreſſe the contrarie by tearming God a valuer of merits in generall: although on the otherſide conſidering his owne weakenes, and the vncertainetie of his owne particular deſeruinges, out of an humble mynde, he feared to put himſelfe vpon God as vpon an eſteemer of the ſame (which in caſe he had had no merits at all might haue failed him) but rather made choyſe at the houre of his departure to caſt himſelfe vpon the mercie of God which hee aſſured himſelfe could neuer be wanting to thoſe who duelie relie vpon his goodnes and bountie. And put the caſe a poore diſtreſſed creature ſhould begge an almes of Sir Hũfrey intreating him to take pitty on him, not as a learned man but as a liberall knight, could he therefore iuſtelie ſay the beggar denied him to be a learned man? no ſuerlie, and why? marie becauſe the beggar although he knew him well enough to be a learned man, yet he knew alſo it was not his learning that could releeue his neceſſity, but his money. After this mãner it happeneth in the caſe we treate of: for as ſuch a begger could not trulie be ſaid to haue renounced the knights learning in that caſe, ſo neither could Cardinall Bell: be iuſtlie ſuppoſed to renounce God as a valuer of merits in the ſtate he was in by recurring vnto him

Non æſtimator meriti ſed venia quæſumus Largitor admittit. Can. Miſſ.

him onely as to a bestower of mercie. And thus we see that Bell: dyed as greate a Romane Catholike as he liued, notwithstanding all Sir Humfrey can say against him he can no sooner make Bellarmin a Protestant thē he can make a Protestant of the Canon of the Masse it selfe which hath the verie same wordes which the Card. Piously, vsed at the houre of his death. Next after *Bellarmine* Sir Humfrey hath placed *Albertus Pighius*, who if we will credit him, telleth vs *he became a Caluinist euen in this verie poynt by reading of Caluins institutions*. Thus he relateth this storie and will haue vs take it on the worde of a knight, but he must pardon vs Romane Catholikes if we refuse to beleeue it vpon the bare relation of an aduersarie, as houlding our selues to haue full as greate authoritie at the least, to denie it as he hath to affirme it. True it is he quoteth a place of the authour in the margin, but citeth not a worde of his in the text, as in the like occasion he vseth to doe, which causeth me to persuade my selfe there is no such matter to be founde, or at least some mistake in Sir Humfrey in the true meaning of his wordes, as he mistooke in Bellarmine. Especiallie considering that Pighius is notoriouslie knowen to haue bene a professed enemie both to Luther and Caluin as his workes doe testifie. And that Pighius differeth both from the Lutherans & Caluinists in the maine

paint.

paint. Of iuſtification it is moſt manifeſt by his whole diſcourſe, and particularlie in that he abſolutelie affirmes in his 53. page of his Controuerſie of iuſtificatiou, that faith alone though it be neuer ſo perfect is not ſufficient to iuſtification, ſaying: *Sed fidem hanc ſolam non ſufficere nobis &c.* in which place although he doth not name or mention Caluin, yet doth he expreſſelie and profeſſedlie diſpute a gainſt that doctriue of his and Luther which putteth iuſtification in faith onelie, ſo that it hence plainelie appeareth that if Pighius did read Caluins Inſtitutions as Sir Humfrey affirmeth, it was not to follow them but to confute them. He quoteth alſo *Ruardus Tapperus* to what purpoſe I know not except it be to fill his margent for oſtentation, and ſo I leaue it till he ſhall further pleaſe to declare his meaning, touching that citation which may be he reſerueth for a fourth edition: in the interim that *Taperus* was a profeſſed papiſt his bookes do witnes. And now hauing made it plainelie appeere that not one of the Romaniſts which the knight citeth in this ſection euer renounced anie point of Poperie before his death, or at the leaſt that no one, nor all the teſtimonies which he produceth out of Romaniſts doe proue anie ſuch renunciation, as he auerreth: and alſo that ſome of thoſe which he alledgeth for proofe of his aſſertion, as true Romaniſts

niſts, were not as much as in externall showe of the Catholike religion long before their death, and ſome of them in no parte of their whole life as is manifeſt in *Iewell*, *Fox*, and *Cooke*, and conſequentlie could not in reaſon be produced by him as witneſſes in fauour of his cauſe noe more then *Martin Luther* or *Iohn Calvin*, this I ſay ſuppoſed, it onelie now remayneth that for the concluſion of this Period we doe not onelie cenſure the Contents of this ſection for vnſounde doctrine, but alſo the authour of it for an indirect and falſe dealer in the confirmation of the ſeame.

The IV. Period.

The fift ſection of the booke is about the impediments of reformation of ſuch thinges as the knight iudgeth inexcuſable in themſelues: and for impediments of reformation, he aſſigneth wordlie pollicie and profitte, the thinges which he calleth inexcuſable are the doctrine of Purgatorie, Indulgences, prayer for the dead, the communion vnder one kinde, worship of pictures, and ſuch other poynts of Catholike doctrine all which hee temerariouſlie affirmeth to be inexcuſable and that onelie by waye of an odious relation of them in particular, but adduceth nothing whereby to proue anie one of them to be ſuch indeede, and

ſo

ſo neither will I proue anie thing againſt him heere more then that he vttereth diuerſe vntruthes in this one ſection. Firſt in that he affirmeth *the faith of Purgatorie is confirmed by Councells meerelie for the benefit of the Pope and his Clergie*, which is nothing els but a manifeſt calumniation without all apparance of trueth, it being a thing wholie improbable and contrarie to common ſenſe, either that ſo manie learned, graue and pious men as vſe to be aſſembled in Councells ſhould determine anie thing as matter of faith meerelie for anie Temporall reſpect whatſoeuer: or that the laitie of the Chriſtian world, eſpeciallie Princes, Kinges and Emperours being ſo much more powerfull as they are knowen to bee, then the Pope and Clergie, ſhould condeſcend to a matter of ſuch indignitie as the knight would haue it and ſo much to their coſt, if they did not otherwiſe aſſure themſelues both of the integrity of thoſe who meete in thoſe aſſemblies, and alſo of the trueth of the doctrine in it ſelfe. Beſides that the ſame is manifeſtlie conuinced of falſitie, for that prayer for the deade, and conſequentlie Purgatorie, was knowen in the world before eyther Pope, or Councells were extant as appeareth by the hiſtorie of the ſecond booke of the *Macchabies* the 12. chapter which our aduerſaries themſelues cannot denie to be a true hiſtorie, though they impudentlie denie it to

be

be Canonicall Scripture against the plaine testimonie of S. Augustine who affirmeth the Church to hould it for such though the Iewes hold the contrarie. So that this is but an odious fiction of Sir Humfrey and his companion sectaries inuented by them in disgrace of the chiefe pastour of the Church and the rest of the Priests without eyther authoritie reason or sence, accusing them as hinderers of reformation who labour most for it, onelie because they refuse to admitte a reformation of their fashioning which indeede is no reformatiō but a deformatiō or defacing of the auncient Church & an introductiō of a certaine new fantasticall Church most disfigured and vglie, *vniformiter differmiter deformis*, voyde of all luster & beauty both internall and externall, nor euer knowne or heard of before the dayes of Luther.

Libros Machabeorum non Iudæi sed Ecclesia pro Canonicis habet. Aug. l. 18. de Cuit. Dei cap. 39.

His second vntruth it in the end of the 39. page, where he affirmeth, that the Romanists in the psalters leaue out the second cōmaundemēt. This secōd vntruth of the knight inuolueth a double vntruth, the first is in that he saith the Romanists leaue out the foresaid commaūdement in their psalters, whereas it is well knowne that in the whole *Psalter* the second cōmaundemēt is not to be foūd, at the least formally as it is one of the ten. But this vntruth because I perceiue it proceedes rather of ignorāce thē malice, I am cōtent to pardon. Yet because when

when he ſaid the Romaniſts lefte it out of their pſalters, he either meant they lefte it out of the text of Scripture, or that they left it out of their catechiſmes onely, I ānſwer that whetherſoeuer he meant, he cānot be excuſed for telling an vntruth, firſt becauſe he falſely ſuppoſeth for certaine, that to be the ſecond commaundement which indeede is but an explication of the firſt, in the opinion both of *S. Auguſtine* and either all or almoſt all other diuines of later yeares. Secondly becauſe thoſe ſame authours: who hould thoſe ſame wordes. *Thou ſhalt not make to this ſelfe any grauen image*, to be the ſecond commandemēt, doe not hould that the Images of Chriſt and his ſaints, and due honour of thē, are prohibitęd by that precept among Chriſtians, but onely a gentilicall or idolatrous vſe of pictures or grauen images of falſe Gods and other ſuch abuſes as be repugnant to the due honour of the true and onely God. Laſtly it is alſo falſe that all Catechiſmes leaue out that precept, if precept it be, as appeareth by the Catechiſme of the Councell of Trent and of *Caniſius* and ſome others. So that you ſee now that the knight is euery way conuinced of an vntruth. And although it is true that in diuerſe of their Catechiſmes the Romaniſts leaue out all the reſt of the firſt commaundement as they lie in the text of the 20. of *Exodus* excepting thoſe: *Thou ſhall haue no other Gods but me.* Yet they

they doe not so with any sinister intention, as the reformers vniustly accuse them to doe, in regard, it is well knowne that those who vse to instruct children in their Catechisme notwithstanding they vse not to fill childrens heads with such proclamations against graue Images as the reformers doe, yet they neuer omitte to declare and explicate exactly the whole tenour of the words of the commaundement, inculcating most diligently the true sense of the same and teaching them how farre it is true that images and the worshippe of them in prohibited by that precept, & the difference betweene the vse of Christian images and those which according to the practice of those times were vnlawfull. But the true reason why Romanists most commonly omitte those wordes: *Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any grauen thing*, and the rest, is because Catechismes being onely a short summe of Religion, it is fitting they be most briefe and compendious as being so more easy to learne and more conformable to the capacity of children, then if they were large and prolixe in wordes, especially considering that that which wanteth in wordes may farre more easily be added by the master by may of explication then many lines can be cõmitted to memory by weake, and vnapt schollers. Neither doe the Romanists make catechismes for Iewes and Gentiles but for Christians and Catholiks

and

and ſo it were both ſuperfluous and impertinent to put in all the wordes of the text or more as the reformers doe, ſome of which doe belong rather to the law of *moyſes* then to the Ghoſpell of Ieſus Chriſt, and therefore for the verie ſame reaſon the Romaniſts leaue out of their Catechiſmes diuerſe words of the precept of the Sabaoth, as iudging them vnneceſſarie for the inſtruction of Chriſtian children. As alſo becauſe according to the doctrine of *S. Auguſtin* in his queſtion vpon this commaundement, thoſe onely words: *Thou ſhalt haue no other Gods but me*: are the whole ſubſtance of the firſt commaundement, and the ſame in ſenſe with the other which immediatly follow in the text, to wit, *thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe any grauen thing*, by which *grauen thing* S. Auguſtin in the ſame place vnderſtandeth an *idol* & not any grauen image as the reformers doe corruptedly vſe to tranſlate and commonly put it ſo in their Catechiſmes for the falſe inſtruction of their children. And hence it plainely appeareth that the Romaniſts leaue not out of any of their bookes of Chriſtian doctrine anie of the ten commandements, but rather that the reformed brothers put in one more then either according to Scripture or the doctrine of *S. Auguſtin* they ought to doe, as by the true diuiſion and number of them at the end of this worke ſhall the be more manifeſtly declared.

Vide illum infra in fine op.

Thirdly

Thirdly it is vntrue which he affirmeth, though by way of insinuatiõ onely, that the Romanists *doe adore a piece of bread.* For it is well knowne they adore not the bread but that which christ, himselfe affirmed to be his body, for which adoration besides the scripture, we say with S. Augustin: *nemo illam carnem manducat nisi prius adorauerit.* Aug. in ps. 98. and so this, though Sir Humfrey as it seemes was ashamed to vtter it plainely, yet it is no lesse then a plaine leasing. Besides these vntrueths which I haue now rehearsed he hath diuerse very idle positions either false or friuolous, as for example *that the power of binding and loosing depends vpon Purgatory, that by defect of the Priests intention the worshipper of the bodie of Christ in the Sacrament may commit flat Idolatry* and the like, these because they are left by him vnproued, I will also leaue them vnrefuted till such time as I shall see his proofes produced, and in the meane time I condemne this whole section, as containing matter both idle, false, calumnious, and full of inuectiue bitternesse and puritannicall spleene against the Romanists accusing them that they *turne the necks of Scriptures cleane about; & that it is a common practice of their Church of Rome to make greater price of victory then verity,* & other such matter as is vnworthy to be published either by printe or pen.

The V. Period.

THe knight in his sixt section promiseth to refute that which he tearmeth the Common practice of his aduersaries in their refusall of reformation, because saith he, we cannot assigne the precise time when errours came in. This I confesse is a matter of importance, and if Sir Humfrey can performe his promise he will in parte recouer the credit which he hath formerly lost; if not, his honour must still lye in the dust. Now to performe his promise he must know that it is not sufficient for him & his partners to assigne the time and persons when and by whom those points of doctrine, which they hould to be erroneously maintained in the Roman Church, were first broached, but they must also by some meanes or other conuince them to be errours indeede. And as long as Sr Humfrey failes in the demonstratiō of either of these, it is manifest he doth not performe his worde. He saith indeede very confidētly in the beginning of this section, that they (meaning as I suppose himselfe and his companions in sect) are all eye-witnesses that the errours, of the Romā Church are this daye so notorious that a very child may perceaue thē; but what is this to the purpose? this is but a friuolous repetition of their owne bare wordes, this is no lawfull

lawfull proofe among aduerſaries, this is no demonſtration, it is not this Romane Catholiks are bound to ſtand too, this is no reaſonable ſatisfaction for vs or any other be he neuer ſo indifferent. We muſt be conuinced of errours by Scriptures, by conſent of auncient Fathers, by plaine definitions of approoued Councels. And till you Sir Humfrey, or ſome of your conſorts make this point cleare, we acknowledge no errours in our Church, and by conſequence no neceſſity of reformation in that nature, as your diſcourſe in this ſection doth falſely ſuppoſe. Moreouer touching the aſſignation of time & perſons, when and by whom the pretended errours of the Roman Church had their beginning, it is apparant the knight is in a great errour, in that he perſuadeth himſelfe that the Romaniſts exact of the reformers to aſſigne the time and perſons when and by whom ſuch errours as they attribut to their Church were firſt broached: For the Romaniſts do not ſtand preciſely vpon aſſignation of the very firſt time and perſons, or the very firſt Authours of thoſe ſuppoſed errours, no they put no ſuch rigorous taske vpon the reformers, but onely oblige them to shewe when they were firſt ſo notorious and apparent in the world, as both they & their authours were condemned in any authenticall Councell or aſſembly, and this is that onely which the Catholikes demaund of their

aduerſaries, and not that which Sir Humfrey imagineth; and therefore whatſoeuer he produceth in this ſection for the confirmation of his intent in that particular, proceedeth vpon falſe ſuppoſition, and conſequently proueth nothing but his owne ignorance. That which is a thing not onely proper to Sir Humfrey in diuerſe places of his booke, but alſo ſo generally incident to the reſt of his conreformers as in reading their workes I haue often lamented their caſe to ſee them ſo labour in vaine like hounds ſpending vpon a falſe ſent. And ſurely nothing els but the foreſaid falſe ſuppoſition was the cauſe why Sir Humfrey proceeded in this point in ſo farre a different manner as he doth from the reſt of his fellowes. He not taking vpon him as they ordinarily doe (tho' without effect) to aſſigne the time when thoſe imagined errours firſt began, and who were the firſt authours of the ſame; but as it were ſuppoſing that to be impoſſible, or els aduerticeing the ill ſucceſſe which his fellow ſectaries haue had in proſecuing their waye, fell vpon a quite contrary courſe, indeauouring to shewe a diſtinction and difference betwixt the hereſies of the *Arians, Pelagians, and Donatiſts*, and the errours which he ſuppoſeth to be in the Roman Church: graunting that thoſe hereſies being ſuch as did (ſaith he) indaunger the foundation and openly diſturbed the Church, might eaſely

be discouered, adding that their first authours de facto were obserued and the times knowne & place pointed at. But the chãge of the Romanists doctrine, saith he, was a secret Apostasie scarcely to be knowne or discouered, condemning also that for an impertinent demaunde which the Catholikes vsually require of the reformers, to wit, that they shewe the first time and produce the first authours of the supposed Romish errours; by this shewing himselfe very desirous to rid his handes of so hard a taske as he hath vndertaken, as doth plainely appeare by those examples and similitudes which he vseth for that purpose tho' not very well applied. And now this being the sense of the first parte of this section, let vs briefely examine how soundly he proueth his intent. In the parable of the sower (saith he) Christ himselfe giues a full answer to those impertinent demaunds, he telleth vs that after the good seede was sowen, the enemy sowed tares when men were a sleepe. Thus he answereth to the impertinent question of the Romaniste as he tearmeth it. But good Sir Humfrey if the question be impertinent why doe you answer to it? why doe not you rather passe it with silence then spend your breath about it? but it seemes you will needes answer, yea and father your answer vpon our Sauiour as if Christ himselfe had answered in the words cited to the same

Matth. 13. 24.

queſtion which you ſay the Romaniſts demaund of you. Fy what application of Scripture is this! are you a maſter in Iſraell and yet ignorant that our Sauiour vſed that Parable to another purpoſe? did not our Sauiour meane by the enemy, the Deuill, by the tares vices, and by the field the ſoule of man? is not this a common expoſition of interpreters? or if you will needes haue it vnderſtood of errours in doctrine, and of the ſower of them in the field of the Church, of which we know there are good ſtore in your congregation, yet can the parable of our Sauiour auayle your purpoſe nothing at all. For that the queſtion of the parable is generall and ſo a generall anſwer was ſufficient. But the demaund of the Roman Catholikes is particular & ſo in reaſon it requiers an anſwer in particular; for example, the queſtion is if Purgatorie be an errour of the Romā. Church, who was the firſt authour of it? In what age did he liue? if not to communicate in both kindes be an errour of the Romā Church, who was the firſt authour of it? &c. So that in the queſtion of the Romaniſts there is no impertinencie in the ſenſe in which they demaūd it, but the knight's anſwer is both impertinent in it ſelfe and alſo falſely fathered vpon our Sauiour.

True it is that the Roman Catholiks, as I haue ſaid before, doe not oblige the knight

nor

nor anie of his consorts to answer so metaphisically to their demaund as he erroneously persuadeth himselfe. But they onely vrge the reformers to name the authours and time of such supposed errours in a morall manner; that is who they were that haue beene in anie lawfull Councell condemned for either the broachers or publike defēdours of those he calles errours. Which is a demaunde so farre from impertinencie, that there hath neuer beene any notorious errour in the Church of God which hath not beene noted so by the writers of the seuerall ages wherein they liued, or at the least, by some others presentlie after their time. And so hence it appeareth manifestlie, that the Roman Catholikes being no wise guiltie of impertinencie in their demaund, yet Sir Humfrey is most impertinent in his answer, and not onelie an impertinent alledger of Scriptures, but also a peruerse detorter of the same, as interpreting them by the direction of his owne priuate spirit, and fathering vpon Christ that which he neuer thought nor intended. And this being the substance of his answer to the Catholikes, which in trueth hath no substance in it: yet he still prosecuteth the same making a greate flourish out of the circumstances of the same parable adding that the tares were sowen by the enemie when men where a sleepe, and that by consequence they

could not ſee him and much leſſe produce him. I confeſſe that there both haue bene and be yet in the world who by reaſon of the exceſſiue moiſture of their braiue haue ſleeped both verie ſoundlie and verie long. I know the hiſtorie of the ſeauen ſleepers who ſlept ſome hundreths of yeares. But I neuer heard of anie kinde of Congregation of people that all and euerie one of them ſleeped about a thouſand yeares together and that ſo profundelie as that not one of them did euer ſo much as once dreame of the enimie who ſowed tares in their field. Isit poſſible that all the good men of the houſes in all that ſpace of tyme and in euerie place should haue bene ſo drowſie and ſo ouercome with ſleepe as none of them could not one tyme or other awake & catch the theefe before the daies of Luther. Surelie there was neuer a Puritane in the world in all that long ſpace of tyme, for if there had bene anie, ſome of them would infalliblie haue awaked, their hott brauies and fierie ſpirits would neuer haue ſuffered them to lie ſo long in a lethargie, but vp they would haue beene and layd about them moſt vallantlie with the whole bulke of the Bible, and haue gone to cuffes with Pennance, Purgatorie and prayer to Saints, with pictures, Pope and praier for the dead, with merits, maſſe, and monaſteries, with confeſſion, tradition, and tranſubſtantiation, with Indults,

faſts,

faſts, and ſatisfactions. Theſe I ſay and all other ſuch like tares as the knight eſteemes them, had bene by thoſe Zealous Paterfamillians rooted out as ſoone as euer they peeped out of the earth, if God had not permitted them to take a greate quantitie of Diapodium or pouder dormant by force of which, as I ſuppoſe, they were all ſo lulled a ſleepe as not one of them could once awake till the tyme of Doctour Luther, who if he had chaunced to haue taken one onelie dramme of the ſame receipt, it is more then probable that greate worke of his had laine vndone till this preſent day, and perhaps for euer. From this parable Sir Humfrey paſſeth to confirme his anſwer by reaſons, ſaying that the doctrine which they complaine of his a myſterie of iniquitie, and myſteries are ſecret and worke not openlie and publikly but by degrees, leaſurelie, cunninglie and warilie to auoyde diſcoueries. Thus he, in which wordes you ſee he cals errours a myſterie, but deſcribes them rather like a monſter then a myſterie, attributing ſuch ſubtiltie vnto them as if they had the vſe of reaſon; whereas all errours which are ſuch trulie, are by nature voyd of reaſon, and ſo, no myſteries but rather monſters. Hee ſaith they are ſecret and worke by decrees: And it is true, errours may be ſecret for a short tyme, but long they cannot, eſpeciallie ſuch as we heere ſpeake of, that is publiklie

blikelie defended by a whole Church and all or moſt of them manie ages together. Mentall and priuate errours may be ſo ſmothered as not onelie not by degrees, but ſo as they neuer come to light and knowledge of the world at all, but vocall errours propoſed and published to the people cannot poſſible be long vnknowne or vndiſcouered. Witnes the errours of Luther and Caluin and of all other condemned heretikes, all which doubtleſſe for a tyme they were, meerelie mentall, yet euen before the death of their authours notice was taken of them, & perhaps alſo they were publikelie condemned. And ſo we ſee by this reaſon Sir Humfrey proueth nothing to this purpoſe, but tels vs of nothing but meere impoſſibillities contrarie both to reaſon and common ſenſe. Neither doth it auaile him for defence of his anſwer to ſaye that errours being at firſt oftentimes in one or few perſons onelie, they cannot eaſilie be eſpied, for this is not that the Catholikes vrge him too, we haue tould him alreadie that wee will not deale ſo rigorouſlie with him, we are content to graunt vnto him that errours onelie ſo farre published, were not eaſilie, eſpeciallie by his drowſie conſociates, to be diſcouered, neuertheleſſe we ſee no reaſon at all why our ſuppoſed errours being ſo publiquelie taught, penned, and preached as they were long before either Luther or

Wicklifs

Wicklifs tyme should not haue bene knowen for errours if such they were, long before either of their daies, This is the point of the queſtion, this is the demaunde the Roman Catholikes vrge, you Reformers are to anſwer, as longe as you goe about the bush as you doe, and anſwer not directlie, neither your Euangelicall parable nor your cockatrice egge, though you write it with a greate letter to make it ſeeme bigger, will ſerue your turne, they are but onelie ſimilitudes or examples ill applied, they prooue nothing but ouelie ſerue you for a vaine flourish. *Exempla illuſtrant non probant*, eſpeciallie if they be equiuocall as yours be. And as for your diſtinction of publike hereſie and ſecret Apoſtacie, it is much more friuolous then all the reſt you haue brought for the proofe of your purpoſe in this ſection. And although perhaps you shewed no ſmall ſubtiltie in it, as you thought, yet is it in it ſelfe a moſt ignorant piece of doctrine, for that not onelie the common and vſuall ſenſe of the worde *Apoſtaſie*, but the verie etimologie of the ſame worde, which ſignifieth a defection or diſceſſion, doth demonſtrate that the thing ſignified by it muſt be a much more externall and publike action in it ſelfe then hereſie vſed to be, and ſo that which is ordinarilie and vulgarilie called *Apoſtaſie*, muſt be publike and not ſecret; and therefore when anie errour

comes

comes to that degree of malice as it may truely be called Apoſtaſie in this ſenſe, it muſt of neceſſitie be knowne, and conſequentlie it is ſuch as cannot be kept ſecret but may be moſt eaſilie diſcerned, yea much more eaſilie then anie hereſie how publike ſoeuer it bee, as being an aggrauating circunſtance of the ſame. And thus we ſee that for the knight to yeeld a reaſon why the errours of the Roman Church could not eaſilie be diſcouered, becauſe they were ſecret Apoſtaſie, is both moſt abſurd in itſelfe, and alſo inuolueth a contradiction in regard it includeth that a thing may be Apoſtaſie that is a thing of it owne ſelfe publike, and yet remaine ſo ſecret that it cannot be diſcouered. Neither is that which Sir Humfrey farther addeth in the ſame place leſſe abſurde to witt that *ſecret Apoſtaſie worketh warelie and cloſelie in the tyme of Darkenes when the ſeruants of the huſbandman are aſleepe*, for if all Apoſtaſie as it is commonlie taken, muſt be publike, as I haue showed, how can it then truelie be ſaid to worke in darkenes or by night? or how can the ſeede of it be ſcattered at vnawares to the ſeruants of the husbandman, certainlie except the ſeruants be ſo ſluggish that they ſleepe both nights and dayes, moneths and yeeres, yea and manie hundreth of yeeres together, naye and all the daies of their life, they cannot but diſcouer the tares of Apoſtaſie, which is

not

not euer in ſeede as the knight falſelie ſuppoſeth, but is the increaſe or rather full growth it ſelfe, or yet rather the ouergrouth of the crop of hereſie which is truelie the ſeede of it.

From hence the knight proceedeth to the ſecond parte of his ſection, in which he endeauoureth to shewe vs an *vndeniable trueth* (as he termeth it) *that ſome opinions were condemned in the Primatiue Church for eroneous and ſuperſtitious which now are eſtablished for articles of faith in the Roman Chnrch*. And for this his poſition he produceth an inſtance out of S. Auguſtin lib. de moribus Eccleſ. Cath. cap. 34. in which place he complaines that in his tyme the ruder ſort of people were intangled with ſuperſtition euen in the true Church: *I my ſelfe* (ſaith he) *know manie that are worshipers of Images and ſepulchers whom the Church condemneth and ſeeketh euerie daie by correction to amend them as vngratious children*: Thus farre Sir Humfrey out of S. Auguſtin. To which I anſwer that this place of S. Auguſtin hath bene ſo often obiected by the moderne ſectaries that it is worne quite thred bare with handling, and I perſuade my ſelfe that all the Catholike authours that euer writt of controuerſies haue ſufficientlie anſwered it if it came in their way. Neuertheleſſe leaſt Sir Humfrey should thinke himſelfe neglected by me, I anſwer firſt that S. Auguſtin complaineth in this place of certaine gentilli-

Nolite conſectari turbas

call

imperitorum qui vel in ipsa vera religione superstitiosi sunt, vel ita libidinibus dediti vt obliti sint quicquid promiserint Deo. Aug. supra.

call errours and abuses in the adoration of images and sepulchers then practised in the true Church by some priuate ignorant and vitious persons, who without distinction either of the one or the other did worship the tombes and pictures of all sortes of people. Secondlie I answer that S. Augustin in the place cited, speaketh not of anie generall doctrine taught in his tyme touching the adoration of pictures, but onelie of some superstitious abuses in the practise of the same, and so also in this respect the obiection is impertinent. I answer thirdlie that suppose there were some particular persons in the tyme of S. Augustine guiltye either in the manner of their worship of pictures or in their doctrine cõcerning the lawfullnes of the same, doth it thence therefore follow that Catholikes are guiltie also of the same crime? or is it consequent, that that honour which Catholikes graunte to the pictures of Christ and his Saincts, is iust the same with that which Saint Augustine mentioneth? No suerlie. For as there may be abuse committed in the due honouring of pictures, so there may be also lawfull vse in the due adoreing of them, and so it is cleere that it is no true manner of argument or true consequence to collect so. Those people whom S. Augustin reprehended for adoring of pictures in his tyme did worship images reprehensiblie: But the Romanists doe also

worship

worship images, therefore the Romaniſts doe worship images reprehenſiblie. This I ſay were it in anie figure, yet is it a captious forme of argument containing a manifeſt fallacie or equiuocation in the *minor* by reaſon of which the Sylogiſme concludeth nothing.

Now vpon the foreſaid wordes of Saint Auguſtin, Sir Humfrey addeth a deſcant of his owne, in which he comits diuerſe faults. Firſt in that he ſaith that although S. Aug. did note ſome people of his time for ſuperſtitious worſhippers of images, yet did hee neither namethe authours of that errour, nor sheweth the tyme when it began tacitlie, intending hence to inferre that neither are the reformers bounde to aſſigne the names of the authours of thoſe errours which they attribure to the Roman Church, nor yet the tyme of their defence of them. But this inference of the knight is no concluſion at all, for that the caſe of S. Auguſtines tyme which is the antecedent of the foreſaid illation of the knights, is farre different from the caſe of the reformers as well for that S. Auguſtin ſpeaketh of an errour which happened in his owne daies (as Sir Humfrey confeſſeth) and perhappes by ſuch perſons as he could not name without preiudice of their fame, as being ſuch as practiſed thoſe ſuperſtitions ſo priuatelie that they were not knowen to more, or at the leaſt, not to manie more then him-

himſelfe; after which manner preachers do vſe to reprehend vices of perſons knowen vnto them, and yet name them not: as alſo and chiefelie becauſe S. Auguſtine was neuer demaunded of them in particular, or anie other waye vrged to declare their names. None of all which circumſtances occurre in the caſe betwixt the Reformers and the Romaniſts, and ſo out of the wordes of S. Auguſtine, which be the Antecedent of the knights argument, no true conſequence can be deduced againſt the Romaniſts.

In has autem ſanctas ac ſalubres obſeruationes ſi qui abuſus irrepſerint, eos prorſus aboleri ſancta Synodus cupit ita vt nullæ falſi dogmatis imagines & rudibus periculoſe errorem præbentes ſtatuantur &c. Con. Trid. ſeſſ. 25. init.

Another fault ſir Humfrey committeth alſo in that he affirmeth that *this corruption which S. Auguſtin and the Church of his time condemned for ſuperſtition was confirmed* 400. *yeeres after by the ſecond Councell of Nice for Catholike doctrine, and is now decreed by the Councell of Trent for an article of faith.* Thus the knight. But this is all falſe, and grounded onelie vpon an erroneous perſuaſion of his owne, videlicet, that the worship which thoſe people of which S. Auguſtin ſpeaketh, gaue to pictures, is the ſame which the Roman Church practizeth at this daye according to the definition of thoſe two Councells; that which he neither proueth heere, nor can euer prouein anie other place, as being manifeſt by the doctrine of thoſe ſame Councells in this point, that they both condemned this ſuperſtitious practice of thoſe people reprehended

by

by S. Auguſtin & the Church of his age, eue as much as he did in thoſe former tymes. And ſo neither this inſtance framed by Sir Humfrey out of S. Auguſtins wordes, nor the whole argument it ſelfe concludes any part of his intent in this ſection: but rather conuinceth by the fact of the ſame S. Auguſtin that no errour can poſſible ſo ſecretlie ſteale into the Church, but it is either preſently or within a ſmall tyme eſpied and noted for ſuch by one authenticall authour or other; which is quite contrary to the poſition which the knight indeauoureth heere to eſtablish and whoely conformable to the tenet of the Roman Church in this matter.

After this Sir Hum. maketh a large repetition of diuerſe points of doctrine defended by the Church of Rome, as if they were farre different from the intention of thoſe who firſt taught or ordeined them, but for this his conceipt he bringeth no proofe at all, and ſo I leaue it as a voluntary *tenet* founded vpon his owne ſmall authority. True it is he produceth diuerſe authours for the confirmation of the ſame alledging them all for Romaniſts, and yet ſome of them are not ſo eſteemed to be, as is manifeſt in *Caſſander*, *and Agrippa*, which the Roman Church houlds not for her true children but rather for illegitimate. Be citeth alſo *Ioannes Ferus* who altho' he was at the leſt once a

Romaniſt, whatſoeuer he was afterwardes, yet there haue beene noted in his workes diuerſe ill ſounding propoſitions, whether it be for that his bookes haue beene corrupted by the ſectaries of theſe times as by ſome editions of his workes may be iuſtly ſuſpected, or whether it be that the man was ſomething more rash in his aſſertions then he ought to haue beene. But howſoeuer it falleth out with him in that nature, yet the place cited out of him by Sir Humfrey if it be rightly vnderſtood, it proueth no more but that by the priuate abuſes and ſuperſtitiõs of ſome particular men, many things ordeined by holy men with a good intention, haue receiued ſome accidentall chaunge. And although Ferus exemplifieth in the feaſts of the Church, Ceremonies, images, Maſſes, monaſteries, yet certaine it is his meaning was not that all theſe are either vnlawfull or ſuperſtitious, or that they are new articles of faith or not to be vſed in the Church of God, as the knight and his cõpanions would haue thẽ to be, but onely out of a pious zeale he wished that ſuch abuſes might be corrected as he perceiued in his daies to haue crept into the practice and vſe of the ſame; which is a thing ſo farre from Sir Humfreys purpoſe of prouing an alteration in the Doctrine of auncient tymes, as it is both very conformable to reaſon, and allſo to the decree of reformation made in the Councell of

Trent

Trent aboue cited. He citeth allso *Marius de schis. & Concil. Et Polidore de inuent. rerum*, as speaking of the vncertainty of the entrance into the Church of Priests mariage. But this is nothnig to the purpose the knight heere treateth. For how I pray you doth this proue that there are errours of faith in the Romã Church, whereas the restraint of mariage of Priests it selfe, is no article of faith as Sir Humfrey ignorantly supposeth, but onely a precept of the Church and a matter of manners; and yet in case it were so in it selfe, neuertheless certaine it is that the question or difficultie about the first begining of the restraint (of such onelie the cited authours speake) is no matter of faith and consequentlie can be no errour euen in Sir Humfreyes owne false supposition of errours in the Roman Church. To omitte that suppose the first begining of the restrainte of marriage in Priests were truelie an article of faith in the Roman Church, yet this being but one particular instance or example drawne out of two Romanists onelie, it cannot sufficientlie proue that generall position of Sir Humfrey, to witte, that there was a knowne tyme when those *tenets* (meaning the points of doctrine which the Councell of Trent defined) were not certainelie knowne or generallie receiued by the Roman Church; since that, according to the rules of Logike no gene-

rall propoſition can be inferred out of a particu-
lar; and that touching the reſt of the articles of
the Roman doctrine, the reformers are ſo farre
from the aſſignation of the time of their be-
ginning, that Sir Humfrey
this verie place is forced to
tyme of the beginning of the
ceſſarie to be aſſigned. And
that both thoſe authours are
purgatorie Index, we are not
dit vnto them: yet this I ſay
they are both here produc
the beginning of the and prol
mariage can not be aſſigned,
argument that it was appoint
tiue Church itſelfe then in
yeares. Beſides this Sir Hum
Polydor in the place he citeth
affirme that mariage of Prei
gether prohibited til the tym
7. but that it could not be taken away till that
tyme. *Alijs ſuper alijs promulgatis legibus non ante Pontificatum Gregorij 7. coniugium adimi occidentalibus ſacerdotibus potuit. Pol. lib. 5. cap. 4. edit. Antuerp. 1554.* Caſſander altho' Romaniſts eſteeme not of his authoritie either *pro* or *contra*, yet here he is corrupted by Sir Humfrey for companie leſt he should laff at his followes, where for thoſe wordes *non temerè reperies* thou shalt not eaſilie finde,

IRRE
PAG

finde, he translates *was not expresselie defined*, speaking of the number of the 7. Sacramẽts, of which Cassander saith that a man shall not ea-

REGULAR

GINATION

stituted anie cer-
f Sacraments be-
è quenquã reperies
aliquem & defini-
unt. Cass. p. 951.
ther to no pur-
de Valentia say-
n the communion
ying of *Valentia*
hat the custome
cient that it hath
consequentlie it
of God since the
s, and by them
addeth pre-
that euer from the
beginning of the Church ther hath beene some
vse of the Eucharist vnder one kinde, as he hath showed before. Which wordes as makeing plainelie against him he was content to omit. So that this testimouie either proueth nothing to the knights purpose, or els more then he desires, a also want of honest dealing in the citation of it. To omitte that when that manner of communion first began in the Church is no article of the Roman faith. The same authour is also once againe cited by Sir

rall propoſition can be inferred out of a particular; and that touching the reſt of the articles of the Roman doctrine, the reformers are ſo farre from the aſſignation of the time of their beginning, that Sir Humfrey him ſelfe euen in this verie place is forced to hould this preciſe tyme of the beginning of the ſame to be vnneceſſarie to be aſſigned. And altho' by reaſon that both thoſe authours are cẽſured in the expurgatorie Index, we are not boũde to giue credit vnto them: yet this I ſaye that ſuppoſing they are both here produced to teſtifie that the beginning of the and prohibition of Preiſts mariage can not be aſſigned, it is rather a great argument that it was appointed by the primatiue Church itſelfe then introduced of later yeares. Beſides this Sir Humfrey doth falſifie Polydor in the place he citeth, for he doth not affirme that mariage of Preiſts was not altogether prohibited til the tyme of Gregorie the 7. but that it could not be taken away till that tyme. *Alijs ſuper alijs promulgatis legibus non ante Pontificatum Gregorij 7. coniugium adimi occidentalibus ſacerdotibus potuit. Pol. lib. 5. cap. 4. edit. Antuerp.* 1554. Caſſander altho' Romaniſts eſteeme not of his authoritie either *pro* or *contra*, yet here he is corrupted by Sir Humfrey for companie leſt he ſhould laff at his followes, where for thoſe wordes *non temerè reperies* thou ſhalt not eaſilie finde,

finde, he translates *was not expresselie defined*, speaking of the number of the 7. Sacramẽts, of which Cassander saith that a man shall not easilie finde anie who haue constituted anie certaine & determinate number of Sacraments before Peter Lombard. *non temerè quenquã reperies ante Petrum Lombardũ qui certũ aliquem & definitum numerum sacramentoũ statuerunt.* Cass. p. 951.

To the like purpose or rather to no purpose he citeth also *Gregory de Valentia* saying *that it doth not appeere when the communion in one kinde beganne*, which saying of *Valentia* is most true, & his meaning is that the custome of communicating so, is so auncient that it hath no knowne beginning, and consequentlie it hath bene euer in the Church of God since the time of Christ and his Apostles, and by them practized. And therefore *Valentia* addeth presentlie after to that purpose, *that euer from the beginning of the Church ther hath beene some vse of the Eucharist vnder one kinde*, as he hath showed before. Which wordes as makeing plainelie against him he was content to omit. So that this testimouie either proueth nothing to the knights purpose, or els more then he desires, a also want of honest dealing in the citation of it. To omitte that when that manner of communion first began in the Church is no article of the Roman faith. The same authour is also once againe cited by Sir

Humfrey for that in the ſame place he affir-meth the foreſaid manner of communion *not to haue bene generallie receiued but a little before the councell of Conſtance*, which is no more to the purpoſe then the other allegation or ſcarſe ſo much. For this and ſome other teſtimonies which he citeth page 60. at the moſt doe but onelie proue that ſome of the points of doctrine, or rather of practice onelie of the Roman Church, were not declaredlie knowen and definede ſucceſſiuelie in all differences of times ſince the eſtabliſhment of the Goſpell; which the Romaniſts do not denie: though they knowe it is a point impertinent to the matter heere in queſtion, which is not whether the Reformers can showe a time when the tenets (as he termes them) of the Roman Church were not certainelie knowne or generallie receiued, but alſo & cheefely whether they were erroneous; and then if ſuch they were, when they were firſt publikelie knowen and by what authenticall Councell they were condemned. Which points becauſe Sir Humfrey hath proued neither of them, neither by the teſtimonies of the authours he cites nor by any other forceable proofe, he hath failed of his purpoſe and promiſe, and no way recouered the reputation in this ſection which he loſt in the former, but rather hath much increaſed his diſcredit, and conſequentlie the cenſure falleth

more

more heauilie vpon him then it hath done before. To the testimonie of Scotus aboute transub. I will answer in an other place.

The VI. Period.

HEere Sir Hũfrey from a diuine is turned Herold and promiseth the Romanists he will shew them their Pedegree in faith drawne downe from the auncient heretikes, and contrarilie the pedegree of his owne faith drawne from Christ and his Apostles. So that heere you see the knight hath vndertaken a large peece of worke, and how he will be able to performe it I know not. It is a double taske and therefore I doubt he will not go through with it without double dealing. And I suspect this the more for that he saith he will proceede *ordine retrogrado*, that is as I conceaue, he will imitate the Crabbe in going backward, and therefore I can expect no better of him then a crabbed piece of busines. He saith he will performe his worke *by ascending vpward*, but indeed his proceeding is so preposterous that a man can find neither ascent nor descent it it. For he begins *which lattine seruice*, as he calleth it and *prayer in a straunge tongue*, the beginning of which he attributeth to Pope *Vitalian about*

the yeere 666. And ends with the reſtraint of mariage of Prieſts which he affirmed in the 60. page, in his former ſection not to *haue bene altogether* eſtabliſhed *till the time of Gregory the ſeuenth;* and ſo according to this he doth not aſcend but deſcend, and yet more then this, in the middle of his ſection he treateth of *tranſubſtantiation as firſt decreed in the Councell of Lateran about foure hundreth yeeres agoe*, and thus you ſee one cannot conceiue that he eyther aſcendeth or deſcendeth directlie, but rather that he skippeth vp and downe like a mad man without anie order at all; but now I will ceaſe to ſeeke order were none is to be found, and come to the examine of the particular paſſages of his pedegree.

He endeauoureth to proue the Roman faith to deſcend from auncient heretikes, firſt becauſe they teach prayer in an vnknowne language not to be vnlawfull, (as ſaith hee) Epiphanius affirmeth of the heretikes *Oſſeni* in the firſt age. But to this I anſwer that *S. Epiphanius* is heere abuſed by the Knight, for he cenſureth not thoſe people of hereſie becauſe they held prayer not to be vnlawfull in an vnknowen language, as Sir Humfrey falſelie and ignorantlie affirmeth, but for other errours of theirs which the ſame Epipha: relates and confutes in his 19. hereſie. Neither doth he

he onelie affirme the *Osseni* to teach *there was no need to make prayer in a knowne tongue* as Sir Humfrey imposeth vpon him to the end their errrour might some to agree with the doctrine of the Roman Church in this particular, but he further chargeth *Elxai* the cheefe prophet of that sect that he deceiued men with idle friuolous and strange wordes containing nothing of that which he imagined, and commaunding his followers to praye in this manner: *Abar, Anid, Moib, Nochile &c.* adding *that they should not seek for anie interpretation of them*, which forme of prayer neuertheless holie *Epiphanius* doth not so much condemne for the strangenesse of the wordes, as for the obscuritie and deformitie of the sense, as appeareth by his wordes here quoted in Latin. All which is farre different from the doctrine and practice of the Roman Church in this point, which neither in sense nor wordes vseth anie other prayers then such as are conformable to that originall prayer which Christ him selfe appointed his disciples to vse: Neither can Epiphanius with anie showe of probabillitie be thought to haue condemned them for heretikes for that which he knew neither to be contrarie to Gods worde, nor anie definition of the auncient Church, either before or in his time. And as for that which the Reformers commonlie al-

Quibus porro verbis & inanibus vocibus postea in ipso libro decipit, cum cum dicit: nemo quarat interpretationem sed solum in oratione hoc dicati, & hec ipsa nimirum ex Hebraica lingua transtulit velut ex parte deprehendimus cum nihil sint ea qua imaginatur, iubet enim dicere: Abar, Anid, Moib, Nochile &c.

lege

lege out of the fourth to the Corinthians and first epistle. I say that if the same Epiphanius had vnderstood it as written against such like prayers, infalliblie he would haue alledged the place against those heretikes. But he well knew that the Apostles meaning was not to condemne prayer in what language soeuer it were, but onelie to preferre propheſie before straunge tonges, or at the most to preferre prayer in a knowne tonge onelie as more edificatiue, not as absolutelie necessarie, and the contrarie to be condemned as vnlawfull or superstitious, as the noueliſts will needes haue it.

And as for precept of the Church the same Epiphanius in like manner knew there was none extant. True it is, in his time the practise of the Greck Church was to haue their prayer in Greeke and the Latin Church in Latin, but as then neither all those of the Latin Church did vnderstand that kinde of Latin which then was vsed in the Church, so neither all those of the Greeke which was vsed in the publike seruice of the Grecians doe (excepting Schollers) as I haue beene truelie informed, by one of that nation; which practise as you see, is nothing contrary to the practise of the present Roman Church but rather agreable vnto it. In regard that tho' the Latin Masse be not vnderstood of all the heares, yet is Latine euen by the confession of one of the most learned Protestants

of this

of this age. The common language in the world and vnderſtood by many. And ſo this citation is no leſſe in effect then a falſification of the foreſaid Father; as is likewiſe another which followeth out of S. Ambroſe whom the knight produceth to the ſame purpoſe, yet citing his wordes ſomewhat corruptedly, which he rehearſeth in this manner. *There were certaine Iewes among the Grecians as namely the Corinthians who did celebrate the diuine ſeruice and the Sacrament ſometimes in the Syriake, and moſt commonly in the Hebrew tongue which the people vnderſtood not.* Thus the knight citeth S. Ambroſe in his Comentary vpon the fourth chapter of the firſt to the Corinthiãs: but his wordes which I haue reade, in Latin are theſe. *Hi ex Hebræis erant qui aliquando Syra lingua, plerumque Hebræa in tractatibus aut oblationibus vtebantur ad commendationem, gloriabantur enim ſe dici Hebræos propter meritum Abrahæ.* Thus S. Ambroſe, where as you ſee that vnderſtands Latin, there be neither the words *diuine ſeruice*, nor the word *ſacrament* to be foũde, but *in tractatibus & oblationibus*, that is as I conceiue in their *exhortations and ſacrifices*. That which as it ſeemes S. Humfrey did deceitfully tranſlate otherwiſe then the wordes doe ſound and ſignifie, leaſt it might appeare to his reader that the Iewes conuerted, euen in thoſe primitiue times did celebrate ſacrifice as the Roman

Church

Church doth now, and not such a drye *Rapsodie* as the reformers doe in these our daies. But that which is most remarkable of all, it is manifest out of the same S. Ambrose in the same Coment; that *S. Paul* did not condemne that practise of the Iewes as contrary to the lawe of God, as the sectaries doe, but onely that he sought to bring them from it as a thing lesse profitable in regard of the Grecians amonge whom they liued, and that in respect of their exhortations or instructions which the Corinthians could not vnderstand in Hebrew or Syriacke. That which manifestly appeareth in the verie same wordes of S. Ambrose immediatly precedent where speaking of the sense and meaning of the Apostle in the place vpon which he commenceth saith onelie: *vtilius est paucis verbis in aperitione sermonis loqui quod omnes intelligãt quam prolixam orationem habere in obscuro*, that is to say: *it is more profitable to speake few wordes in plaine speach which all may vnderstand, then to haue a long oration or praier in obscurity.* Besides this: those last words: *which the common people vnderstood not*, are none of S. Ambroses, but added by Sir Humfrey and foisted in as if they had beene the reason yeelded by S. Ambrose, why the Iewes did amisse in vsing their seruice in an vnknowne language, whereas yet he expressely saith they did it *for ostentation and commendation*, so that S. Humfrey dealeth heere deceiptfully in

diuers

diuers reſpectes for the aduantage of his falſe cauſe. For iuſtification of the which he vttereth a moſt impudent vntruth in his owne wordes following: affirming, that *Sainct Paule wrote that whole chapter of the fourteenth of the firſt to the Corinthians expreſſely againſt prayer or diuine ſeruice in an vnknowne tongue*, whereas in truth the Apoſtle expreſſely and directly laboureth onely to perſuade the Corinthians that it is better to propheſie, that is, to interpret Scriptures, then to exerciſe *donum linguarum*, the done or guift of tongues. And altho' the Apoſtle in one place makes mention of prayer or prayſing of God in generall ſaying, *ſi benedixeris lingua &c.* yet he neither maketh expreſſe mention of publike ſeruice in a knowne language, nor giueth anie precept about it, but onely preferreth that praier which he who prayeth vnderſtandeth before that which he vnderſtandeth not; and that not abſolutelie, but onelie with relation to that time; leauing it for future times to the diſcretion of the Church to be determined according to the condition & nature of the perſons that liue in it, and other circumſtances. Alwaies ſuppoſing that although, *cæteris paribus*, ſome one thing be better then another euen *ex natura rei*, yet by ſome notable change of the time, place, or perſons, that ſame thing which once was more profitable, may afterwardes become leſſe profitable, yea and ſometimes quite vnprofitable,

ble, or at the leaſt of very ſmall eſtimation, and importance. And yet for all this our Puritanicall crue runne ſo a madding with their Bible craſte, that they will needes haue a precept where none is, rather then want their wils, eſpecially if it be to Croſſe the Papiſts. That which cānot appeare more plainely then in the matter of which we now treate, where the knight for the concluſion of his diſcourſe citeth Sainct Paul his wordes in forme of a precept, as if he had ſaid *pray with the ſpirit, praye with the vnderſtanding alſo*, whereas the Apoſtles wordes are onely theſe, *orabo ſpiritu, orabo & mente, that is I will pray with my ſpirit, I will pray with my vnderſtanding*, in which forme of ſpeach you ſee there is no forme of precept or commaund at all, except one will corrupt the text as he hath done.

The knight alſo cites one *Wolfius* as affirming that Pope *Vitalian* firſt introduced Latin ſeruice & praier in an vnknowne tonge. But he might haue ſaued the labor of citing that authour whom he knowes we doe not admit as a competent witneſſe in regarde we finde him to be a wolfe indeed that is an enemie to our religiō, and for ſuch he is noted in the Index Epurgatorie. How be it we doe not denie but that *Vitalian* for the conſeruation of vniformity in the publike ſeruice of the Church might make a generall ordinance in that particular and extend the practiſe of ſome particular and moſt auncient Churches of the Weſt in which Latin ſer-

tice was euer vſed, to all the reſt of the Occidentall Churches. Neuertheleſſe we denie that by this action he either did contrarie to Gods lawe or renewe the hereſie of the *Oſſeni* which I haue shewed all readie out of *S. Epiphanius* to haue beene of a farre different nature notwithſtanding out aduerſarie doth indeuoure falſelie to perſuade the ſame to his ſimple reader neither was this as the knight vntruelie affirmes to introduce ſeruice in a ſtrange language, but rather in the moſt knowne in the world & that in which moſt nations agree: and ſo this may ſerue to demonſtrate that the Romaniſts deriue not this parte of their Pedagane frō auncient heretikes (as our aduerſarie doth calumniate) but frō the practiſe of the moſt aūcient Church at the leaſt in the weſt partes of the world to wit the Apoſtolicall Church. And heare we ſee alſo that Sir Humfrey in ſteede of deriuing the Pedegree of the Roman faith from Iewes and heretikes he deriues his owne from the Father of lyes that is from the abuſe of both ſcriptures and auncient Fathers of the Catholike Church.

In the next braunch of the Pedegree he plaplaceth tranſſubſtantiation, going about to proue that it was the doctrine or at leaſt the practiſe of certaine heretikes named *Helteſaitæ*, who faigned a two fould Chriſt as (ſaith Sir Humfrey) the Maſſe Preiſts doe, who admit one bodie with all his dimentions and properties

ties in heauen, and other in the Sacrament which hath noe properties of a true bodie. Thus Sir Humfrey talkes moſt abſurdely, ignorantly and falſely. Ignorantly for that according to this diſcourſe he houldes the want of locall dimenſions or properties of a bodie ſufficient to cauſe an abſolute, indiuiduall, & ſuſtantiall diuerſitie in it, and to diſtinguish it really from it ſelfe and ſo to make it an other diſtinct bodie which is ſo voyde of reaſon that if he had not bene groſſely ignorant in Philoſophie haue he would neuer vttered ſuch doctrine vnworthie of other confutation them a ſchoole ſtampe or hiſſe. He ſpeake alſo falſely firſt in that he either affirmes or ſuppoſes Preiſts to admit that Chriſts bodie in the Sacrament is without anie properties of a true bodie. For they all contrarily teach and beleeue that as Chriſts bodie in the Sacrament is the ſame which is in heauen, ſo hath it all the ſame properties excepting locall extenſion. Secondly he ſpeakes falſelie in that he Fathereth that on Preiſts which none of them either thought or tought, and ſo makes them guiltie if the Helceſaits hereſie onelie for that which he hath forged in his owne phantaſticall braine. Alſo abuſing the authority of learned Theodoret in miſaplying his words in which he vtters not anie iot or title by which it can be gathered that theſe heretikes meant of Chriſt in the Sacrament when they faigned a double Chriſt;

but

but of two visible Christs, the one aboue I knowe not where, and the other belowein the world or I knowne not where els: adding that the supernall Christ did in former times liue in manie, but at being descended from aboue. And more, they sayde, he passed into other bodies, & other such like fabulous stuffe they haue of Christ which neuer enterd into the cogitations of any people of learning and iudgement; and therefore it is as great dotage in Sir Humfrey to impose this vpon Catholike Roman Preists as it was in the authour to inuent it, as will yet more plainely appeare by the formall words of Theodoret which here I put in the margin.

And the like absurditie Sir Humfrey commits in that which immediatly followees, attributing the doctrine of transsubstantiation to one *Marke*, an heretike, becausse for sooth he by some kinde of inchaunting inuocation ouer the Sacramentall cuppe caussed the wine to appeare like bloud, which sacrilegious example and practise of *Marcus* what force it can haue to proue the Romanists to be of that fellowes Pedegree let any indifferent man be iudge. And moreouer to take away all doubt and assure himselfe the more, let the reader but consider what S. Irenæus in the same place cited by Sir Humfrey videlicet. libr. 1. cap. 9. saith of that Marcus, I doubt not but he will, see most clearely how egregiously our aduersarie abuseth the Roma-

Christum autem non vnũ dicunt (Helceſaitę) ſed hũc quidem infernè, illum verò ſupernè, & eum olim in multis habitaſſe, poſtremò autem deſcẽdiſſe. Ieſum autẽ aliquando ex Deo eſſe dixit (Elxai) aliquãdo vocat ſpiritũ. quandoq; autem Virginem matrem habuiſſe, in alijs autem ſcriptis ne hoc quidẽ; Rurſus autem eum etiam dicit tranſire in alia corpora & in vnoquoq;

tempore diuerſe oſtendi. Theodor. heret. fab. to. 2. lib. 2. pag. 380.

niſts in this matter. *Marcus* (ſaith S. Irenæus) *pro calice vino mixto fingens ſe gratias agere, & in multum extendens ſermonem inuocationis, purpureum & rubicundum apparere facit vt putetur ea gratia ab ijs qui ſunt ſuper omnia, ſuum ſanguinem ſtillare per inuocationem eius, & valde concupiſcere preſentes ex illo guſtare poculo vt in illos ſtillet quæ per magum hunc vocatur gratia.*

By which words let the reader if he vnderſtand Latin iudge how voyde of grace is he who ſo shameleſſelie applies this to the Conſecration of the Euchariſt by Preiſts of the Roman Church.

And yet the prepoſterous knight not being content to haue ſpoken ſo irreaſonably, yet further addes that the authours of tranſſubſtantiation were thoſe diſciples that beleaued the the groſſe & carnall eating of Chriſts Flesh. From whence he would deduce that the Romaniſts deſcend from the Iudaicall Capharnaits in this point.

But this is a moſt groſſe and ridiculous conceipt of him to imagin that they can be ſucceſſours to ſuch as refuſed expreſſely and abſolutely to beleeue that ſame which they hould for a matter of faith tho' not in the ſame groſſe manner which thoſe incredulous diſciples of Chriſt did apprehend, and as you alſo not like reformers but deformers out of the madneſſe of your noddles groſſely conceiue them to doe:

but

but in a much more ſpirituall manner, and yet, truely, really and ſubſtantially, and not onely in ſpirit as your priuate ſpirits would haue it. Which, if it were ſo onely, it were not the true Sacrament, which neceſſarily requires to containe really and not by faith onely that which it repreſẽts: but it were onely a meere shadowe or figure of a Sacrament as the ſacrifice of Melchiſedech, the manna and bread of Propoſition were ſignes and figures of the Sacrament of the holie Euchariſt as not containing but onely repreſenting the body and blõde there contained.

And ſuppoſing that Sir Humfrey himſelfe abſolutely denies the reall preſence of Chriſts body and bloud in the Sacrament, and ſuppoſing alſo that as S. Iohn doth teſtifie the Capharnaits did alſo refuſe to beleeue the ſame, this fable of Sir Humfrey, *mutato nomine*, may much more aptely and truely be verified of him and his companions (I will not ſay then of the Romaniſts) but euen then of the Capharnaits themſelues; in regarde the Capharnaites, as farre as can be gathered by the text of the ſixt of S. Iohn, did according to the interpretation of S. Auguſtin but onely make queſtion of the reall preſẽce, or poſſibility of Chriſts giuing his bodie to be eatẽ not otherwiſe thẽ in that groſſe manner which they then conceiued in their mindes, whereas yet the knight and the reſt of his congregation directly & abſolutely affirme

that Christs body and blood are as farre from being really contained in the Sacrament as heuen is from the altar or Communion table. And thus it appeares that by indeauouring to make vs Capharnaites, Sir Humfrey showes greater grosseneſſe of cõceipte them the groſſe Capharnaites did by denying the reall preſence vpon the ſame or like carnall imagination for for which he and his mates renounce it.

From this Sir Humfrey paſſes to another parte of his Pedegree wher he puttethin the Popes ſupremacie as if it were deriued fundamentally from the Gentils, and to this purpoſe he applies the wordes of our Sauiour Lucæ. 22. 25. ſo ridiculouſly that it makes me thinke he is will read in the booke of Quodlibets or quæris, he makes vſe of Scripture ſo ingeniouſly.

The wordes of our Sauiour are theſe. *The King of the Gentils exerciſe Lordship ouer them, and they that exerciſe authority vpon them are called benefactours*. Out of which place Sir Humfrey will needes inferre and prooue that the Gentiles haue giuen the Pope his ſupremacie and conſequently that they are the benefactours and founders of the Roman faith in that particular. Which paſſage of the Scripture how falſely and impertinently it is applied and how contrary to the true ſenſe thoſe words of our Sauiour are vſed and abuſed by the knight, I will not ſpend time in examination of it, but leaue

leaue to the iudicious reader to cenſure of it as he pleaſeth: onely I cannot omitte to take notice how he concludeth this his idle diſcourſe with another place of Scripture, out of the 20. of S. Math. where our Sauiour ſaith to his diſciples, whoſoeuer will be greate amonght you, let him be your miniſter, & whoſoeuer will be chiefe among you, let him be your ſeruant: by which words it is moſt apparēt & agreed vpon by all interpreters, except the nouelliſts, that our Sauiour intended nothing els but to giue his diſciples a leſſion of humility, not ſo that they ought not in any caſe to haue ſuperiority and dominion in that nature one ouer an other, which were to deſtroy the Hierarchy & gouernment of the Church which he himſelfe ordained, but that thoſe who were to haue it should not abuſe it by dominiering tirānically ouer their ſubiects or ſubordinates. And yet Sir Hūfrey I know not by what rule of Alchimie, will needs extract out of this place that his and his fellowes doctrine touching the ſupremacy is receaued from Chriſt himſelfe. But in trueth with all my Logike I cannot vnderſtand how he inferreth any thing hence for his purpoſe except he will deduce *ex quolibet quodlibet*, and make a noſe of way of the holy Scripture as indeed he doth very frequently, framing ſuch a ſenſe to the wordes as maketh for his poſition, and thence deduceing arguments for

proofe of the ſame. And if one were diſpoſed to make vſe of Scripture in that mãner, he might aſwell inferre out of this place a kinde of ſupremacie for the miniſtrie, eſpecially if we write the word miniſter with a greate M. as Sir Hũfrey doth. And indeede I muſt confeſſe that your miniſters are greate among you in diuerſe reſpects. For ſome of thẽ haue greate Bishoprikes, others greate benefices, and allmoſt all greare wiues and greate ſtore of children. And if the King would be pleaſed to ſuffer them, thẽ why might they not come to obtaine the ſupremacie euery one is his turne by ſucceſſion, & in that caſe they might doubtleſſe make farre better vſe of the cited places of Scripture in fauour of themſelues then they doe in applying them againſt the Romaniſts. And according to his falſe dealing in applying the Scripture, ſo doth he falſely affirme that the Popes ſupremacy was firſt graunted by Phocas falſely applying the teſtimony of Vrſpergenſis to that ſame fol. 149. for Valentinian the Emperour who liued aboue 100. yeares before Phocas in his epiſt. to Theodoſius which is extant in the preambles of the Councell of Calced. ſayth of the Bishop of Rome, *to whõ all antiquity gaue the principalitie of preiſthood aboue all &c.* And as for Viſpergenſis altho' the authoritie of his booke may iuſtely be ſuſpected as hauing ben publiſhed by the reformers or rather deformers

of

of Basill, yet doth he not say as Sir Humfrey affirmes that Phocas first granted the supremacie to the Bishop of Constantinople, but rather the quite contrarie, for thus he sayth. *Post Gregorium Bonifacius sedit cuius rogatu Phocas constituit sedem Romanæ & Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ caput esse omnium Ecclesiarum, cum antea Constantinopolitana Ecclesia se scribebat primam omnium.* *After Gregorie (saith Vrspergensis) Bonifacius did sit at whose request Phocas constituted the seat of the Roman and Apostolicall Church head of all Churches: for before the Church of Constantinople writ her selfe first of all Churches.* So that as the reader may plainely knowe, Sir H. hath falsified Vrspergensis relating that to be said by him of the Church of Constantinople which he directly speakes of the Church of Rome: which neuertheleſſe is so little to his purpose that howsoeuer he takes it, being not a gift of the Emperour (as not being in his power since that *nemo dat quod non habet*) but onely a declaratiue constitution, I cannot conceiue why our aduersarie should haue corrupted this authour except it were to exercise his hād. especially supposing it is a thing vnpossible to apprehēd how either Phocas or anie other mā or Angell could giue the Pope of Rome his supremacie (which is that in this passage he intendeth to proue) by cōferring the same (according to our aduersaries relation) vpon the Bishop of Cōstantino-

ple. And so I leaue this for one of S. Hũfreyes vnintelligible mysteries of his reformed faith.

For worship of Images S. Hũfrey deduceth the Pedegree of the Romanists frõ the Basilidians and Carpocrationes. But his deduction is false & for it he falsely citeth S. Ireneus, who saith indeede those fellowes were heretikes for worshipping of images but in another kinde farre differẽt from the honour which the Romanists vse towards pictures. And he expresselye condẽneth Carpocrates as plainely appeareth by his wordes, because he put the Image of Christ among the images of gentilicall Philosophers, and because also he put a croune vpon it, and worshipped it in an Ethnicall manner, and not according to the custome of Christians, but as S. Epihanius heres. 27. explicateth, those heretikes, *Gentilium ministeria perficiebant*, they sacrified vnto all those images to wit of Pithagoras & Aristotle together with Christs image after the manner of the Gentiles: and so this parte of the Pedegree containes an errour in in heraldry, and proueth no true descent.

In the next passage which is aboute the Communiõ in both kinds Pope Leo tells vs, saith the Knight, that the Manicheis a sorte of heretikes in his time vsed the Sacrament in one kinde videlicet in bread onely. It is true S. Leo saith so, but he doth not condemne them for heretikes for that reason, but be cause they abstained frõ wine

Vtuntur autẽ imaginibus & incantationibus, & reliqua vniuersa perverga. Irenæus. l. 1. cap. 23.

Imagines depictas quasdam de reliqua materia habent fabricatas dicentes formam Christi factam á Pilato illo in tẽpore quo fuit Iesus cum hominibus & has coronant & ponunt eas cum imaginibus mũdi Philosophorũ

wine as from an vncleane creature, and becauſe they did not beleeue that Chriſt had bloud in in his body, and ſo that which Pope Leo did when he gaue commaunde that thoſe should be diligētly obſerued who vſually receiued but in one kind, was done purpoſely for diſcouerie of the Manicheis who craftily to conceile their hereſie touching the truth of Chriſt humanity communicated with the Catholikes diſſemblingly: the Cuſtome of that time being to communicate ſometimes in one kinde and in both, as now the Grecians practiſe, and therefore that holy Pope did diſcretely commaunde thoſe should be diligently obſerued who in all occaſions did vſe to receiue vnder the forme of bread onely, houlding that for an euidēt argumētof their aborring of the bloud of Chriſt. By which it is euident that euen that ſame time the communiō was lawfully vſed by ſome in one kinde otherwiſe S. Leo needed not to haue vſed any great diligence for the diſcouerie of the Manicheis in regard that if all generally had bene obledged to cōmunicate in both, the Manicheis who frequented the Communion would haue beene diſcouered at the firſt by their abſtaining from the chalice. And in like manner the knight abuſeth Bell: touching a proofe of his taken from the example of the Nazarites as if he had deriued wholy or chiefly the communion of one ſpecies or kinde

videlicet cum imagine Pythagoræ & Platonis & Ariſtotelis & reliquem, & reliquorū obſeruationem circa eas ſimiliter vt gentes faciunt. Iren. eod. l. cap. 24. Cum ad regendam infidelitatem ſuam (Videlicet Manichei) noſtris auderāt ineſſe myſterijs ita in Sacramentorum communione ſe temperant vt tutius lateāt, Ore indigno Chriſti corpus accipiunt ſanguinem

kinde from the practise of their communion, whereas he doth not so, but hauing by other arguments of Scriptures, Fathers, Councells and reasons sufficiētly established the doctrine of the Church in that particular; he bringeth that of the Nazarites onely as a confirmation of the same.

iautem redemptionis nostræ omnino haurire declinant. Leo ser. 4. in quad.

Lastlie the knight concludeth this point with those wordes of S. Luke, drinke you all of this, whereby he would proue that the communion in both kindes came from Christ, and so it did indeede, but not by precept giuen to all in generall, but onelie to those then present and to those whome they represented as to be their successours that is the Apostles, and all Priests after them but not to anie Puritan or Puritannicall minister as not hauing from them anie true succession. After these passages Sir Humfrey proceeds to inuocation of Saints and Aungels, the founders of which he affirmeth to haue bene the heretikes called Angelici, and for this citeth Saint Augustine *ad quod vult Deum*. But this is idle for the Angelicalls were heretikes not for the inuocation of Angells, but either for that they held them to haue bene creatours of the world, or in regard they vsed to boast of their owne Angelicall manner of life, or because as Saint Augustin testifieth they were so addicted to adore Angels, that they did vse to worship them with latria or diuine honour,

Erant in Angelo-

honour, all which kinde of adoration the Romaniſts with the ſame Saint Auguſtin giue to one onelie God. And ſo the knight doth peruert the trueth and abuſeth S. Auguſtine who in his 61. q. vpon the Geneſ. explicating that paſſage of Apocalips 19. in which the Angell prohibited S. Iohn to adore him ſaith: neither let it moue the that in a certaine place of ſcripture the Angell doth prohibite a man to adore him and doth admonish him that he rather adore God: for the Angell did ſo appeere that he might haue adored him for God, and therefore ſaith S. Aug. the adorer was ro be corrected by which it is manifeſt that when S. Auguſtin teacheth that the Angelici were heretikes becauſe they were inclined to adore Angels, he meanes becauſe they adored them with diuine honour and not becauſe they gaue that due inferiour worship vnto them which the Romaniſts vſe.

rum cultum inclinati quos Epiphanius iam omnino defeciſſe teſtatur. Aug. hæreſ. 29.

For workes of merit and ſupererogation hee produceth for authours the heretikes named Cathari and Puritans, but the hereſies of theſe ſectaries were farre different from the doctrine of the Romaniſts touching theſe two points. Nay they were neuer defenders of either merit or workes of ſupererogation that euer I read, but that for which they were condemned by the Catholike Church was chiefelie for their defence of the errours of Nouatus and particularelie for denying remiſ-

ſion

kinde from the practise of their communion, whereas he doth not so, but hauing by other arguments of Scriptures, Fathers, Councells and reasons sufficiētly established the doctrine of the Church in that particular; he bringeth that of the Nazarites onely as a confirmation of the same.

autem redemptionis nostræ omnino haurire declinant. Leo ser. 4. in quad.

Lastlie the knight concludeth this point with those wordes of S. Luke, drinke you all of this, whereby he would proue that the communion in both kindes came from Christ, and so it did indeede, but not by precept giuen to all in generall, but onelie to those then present and to those whome they represented as to be their successours that is the Apostles, and all Priests after them but not to anie Puritan or Puritannicall minister as not hauing from them anie true succession. After these passages Sir Humfrey proceeds to inuocation of Saints and Aungels, the founders of which he affirmeth to haue bene the heretikes called Angelici, and for this citeth Saint Augustine *ad quod vult Deum*. But this is idle for the Angelicalls were heretikes not for the inuocation of Angells, but either for that they held them to haue bene creatours of the world, or in regard they vsed to boast of their owne Angelicall manner of life, or because as Saint Augustin testifieth they were so addicted to adore Angels, that they did vse to worship them with latria or diuine honour,

Erant in Angelo-

honour, all which kinde of adoration the Romaniſts with the ſame Saint Auguſtin giue to one onelie God. And ſo the knight doth peruert the trueth and abuſeth S. Auguſtine who in his 61. q. vpon the Geneſ. explicating that paſſage of Apocalips 19. in which the Angell prohibited S. Iohn to adore him ſaith: neither let it moue the that in a certaine place of ſcripture the Angell doth prohibite a man to adore him and doth admonish him that he rather adore God: for the Angell did ſo appeere that he might haue adored him for God, and therefore ſaith S. Aug. the adorer was ro be corrected by which it is manifeſt that when S. Auguſtin teacheth that the Angelici were heretikes becauſe they were inclined to adore Angels, he meanes becauſe they adored them with diuine honour and not becauſe they gaue that due inferiour worship vnto them which the Romaniſts vſe.

rum cultum inclinati quos Epiphanius iam omnino defeciſſe teſtatur. Aug. hæreſ. 29.

For workes of merit and ſupererogation hee produceth for authours the heretikes named Cathari and Puritans, but the hereſies of theſe ſectaries were farre different from the doctrine of the Romaniſts touching theſe two points. Nay they were neuer defenders of either merit or workes of ſupererogation that euer I read, but that for which they were condemned by the Catholike Church was chiefelie for their defence of the errours of Nouatus and particularelie for denying remiſ-

ſion

sion of sinnes and the authoritie of the keyes in the Church, and for that they affirmed their owne pretended puritie to be aboue the doctrine of the Apostles as not conteyned in it but farre exceeding it, and therefore they were called Cathari that is pure ones. *Cathari qui seipsos isto nomine propter munditiam superbissime atque odiosissime nominant: Secundas nuptias non admittunt, pœnitentiam denegant. Nouatũ sectantes hæreticum, vnde etiam nouatiani appellantur. S. Aug. hæres.* 38. And S. Isidor in the verie place cited by Sir Humfrey saith of them. That they named them selfes Cathari for their puritie for *glorying* saith hee *in their merits they denie pennance &c.* And so it appeares by this that the knight belyes Saint Isidor in two respects. Because he quotes him lib. 8. cap. de Hæres. Christian: as if he did testifie that these heretikes were the first authours of doctrine of merit, and workes of supererogation. Whereas S. Isidor hath neither the one nor the other. Nor yet makes anie mention in that place of workes of superogation.

And so according to this lette our Puritans of England, and Sir Humfrey him selfe as none of the least of them, examen their consciences well, and doubtles they will finde themselues to haue farre more affinitie with the foresaid fellowes then the Romanists, who both grant remission of sinnes by vertue of the Eccle-

siasticall

ſiaſticall keyes and allſo denie and renounce all ſuch puritie of Spirit as the Puritans pretended.

He addeth for concluſion the worship of the bleſſed Virgin Marie to haue bene the hereſie of the Collyridians, and reſtraint of the mariage of Prieſts he attributeth to the Tatians and Manicheis, and for proofe of this he citeth Epiphanius hereſie 79. and 46. But he abuſeth this authour in both thoſe places. And firſt touching the Collyridians both the ſame Epiphanius and others doe expreſſelie teach that they worshipped our bleſſed Ladie idolatrouſly by attributing diuinity & ſacrificying vnto her, or her image a cake of bread or tart as the verie worde it ſelfe in greeke doth ſignifie; and ſo this ſuperſtitious hereſie can be no part of the Popish pedegree. Moreouer Sir Humfrey doth falſelie affirme that Epiphanius calles thes women Idolaters, for he doth not in anie place giue them that generall name, altho' they iuſtelie deſerued it, but he calles them *ſimulachrificæ* that is ſacrifiers to images, which is an hereſie as much repugnant to the Roman Catholikes doctrine as it is to Proteſtancie: which worde alone is ſufficient to cleare the Romaniſts from the hereſie of thoſe profane people: but this, as it ſeemes, the craftie Cauallier diſſembled for the aduantage of his falſe accuſation. Secondlie concerning the hereſie of the

Quædam mulieres currum quendam ſiue ſellam quadratam ornantes expanſo ſuper ipſum linteo in die quadam illuſtri anni per aliquot dies panem ponunt & offerunt Mariæ. Epipha: impreſ. Baſilicæ Iano Corn. interp. omnes autem panem participant in totum enim hoc mu-

Tatians

lieris opinio est. ibidem. Continentiam prædicat nuptias autem scortationem putat asserens nihil differre matrimonium a scortatione sed idem esse. Epiphaibid. nec recipiunt in suorum numerum coniugio vtentem. Aug. hær. 25.

Tatians it is certaine out of that Epiphanius, Ireneus, and others that they reiected Matrimonie absolutelie and compared it to fornication which as the world knowes the Roman Church doth not, but onelie for the greater decencie and reuerence to the seruice of God, prohibits it in those onelie who dedicate themselues to the same by receauing holie orders and priesthood. And thus you see Sir Humfrey insteede of deducing the succession of the Romanists from auncient heresies, he makes but a Pedegree of his owne lyes. And the like I say of the Manicheans whome the knight falselie, and iniuriouslie affirmes to haue beene our predecessours in that they prohibited mariage in Preists quoting in the margent *S. Epiphanius heresie* 46. whome neuertheless I haue diligentlie read but cannot finde it. Yet I finde in Saint Augustin who both followed S. Epiphanius much in his descriptions of heresies, and also was better acquainted then anie writer of his tyme with the errours of the Maniches, that they did not onelie prohibit matrimonie in Preists, but that they absolutelie detested the same, for so he saith of those sectaries. *Verum si ad virginitatem sic adhortamini quemodum hortatur Apostolica doctrina: qui dat nuptum bene facit, & qui non dat nuptum melius facit vt bonum esse nuptias dicere-*

lib. 3. contra faust. Manich. cap. 6.

tis, sed meliorem virginitatem sicut facit Eccleſia

qua

quæ vere Ecclesia Christi est, non vos spiritus sanctus ita prænuntiaret dicens prohibentes nubere. Ille enim prohibet qui hoc malum esse dicit, non qui huic bono aliud melius anteponit. Denique eum vos precipue concubitum detestamini qui solus honestus & coniugalis est, & quem matrimoniales quoque tabulæ præse gerunt liberorum procreandorum causa, vnde vere non tam concumbere quam nubere prohibetis. And presentlie after. *Nec ideo vos dicatis non prohibere qui multos vestros auditores obedire nolentes in hoc, vel non volentes, salua amicitia toleratis, illud enim habetis in doctrina vestri erroris, hoc in necessitate societatis.* Thus plainelie S. Augustin whose wordes to make them also plaine to those who vnderstand not Latin I will put them in English. *But if* (saith he) *you so exhorte to virginitie as the Apostolicall doctrine dōth exhorte: he who giueth in mariage doth well, he who doth not giue in mariage doth better so that you should say that mariage is good, but virginitie better, as that Church doth which is truelie the Church of Crist, the holie spirit would not thus prenuntiate you saying: prohibiting to marie, for he doth prohibit who saith this is euill, not he who doth preferre before this good thing an other thing better then it. Finallie you doe cheeflie deteste that carnall coniunction which onelie is honest and matrimoniall, and which the matrimoniall writings also declare to be for procreation of children, whence it is that you doe not so much pro-*

hibit

hibit carnall copulation as you prohibit mariage. And presentlie after the same S. Augustin addeth. *Neither therefore can you say that you doe not prohibit to marie. Because manie of your auditours being not willing or refusing to obey in this, you tolerate them for frendship sake, for you haue that in your doctrine of your errour, this in necessitie of societie.* By which wordes of this most famous doctour we may plainelie gather that suppose S. Epiphanius had those wordes: *in sacerdotibns*: yet he did not meane of Preists onelie when he spoake of the Manichean heresie, but of a direct and absolute prohibition of mariage as vnlawfull and detestable in all sortes of persons: and consequentlie this passage of Sir Humfrey drawne out of the wordes of S. Epiphanius containeth no kinde of disproofe of Roman Catholike doctrine in this particular, but a saule impositure of his owne, if he can not produce out of this authour the wordes which he citeth.

Dices mihi omnino in quibusdam locis adhuc liberos gignere presbyteros, Diaconos, & Hypo-

And whereas he affirmes that the Maniches were our predecessours & prohibited mariage in Preists quoting S. Epiphanius in the margent, I finde no such heresie in his Cathalogue of the heresies of Manicheus: but contrarilie I am sure I finde in an other place of his workes that Preists were by the Eccleſiasticall Canons prohibited to marie. For thus he speaketh. *Doubtlesse you will tell me that euen yet in certaine*

places

places Preists. Deacons and Subdeacons getteth children. But this is not according to the Canon but according to the myndes of men &c. And with theſe and other errours which he affirmeth to be taught in the Roman Church but doth not ſpecifie, he endeth his Pedegree of the Romaniſts, which though he houlds it to haue deſcended either from auncient heretikes, or at the leaſt *to haue*, as he ſaith, *neere affinitie with their adultered iſſue*, neuertheleſſe preſentlie after hauing better examined his conſcience and conſidered more deliberatelie of the matter, he ſeemes to looſe ſome of his former confidence, and ſo adderh that if he hath fayled in calculating the right natiuitie of their auncient doctrine, yet ſure I am, ſaith hee, they are vtterlie deſtitute of a right ſucceſſion in perſons and doctrine from the Apoſtles and the auncient orthodox fathers of the primatiue Church, ſo the knight, by which diſcourſe you may eaſilie perceiue euen by his owne wordes, and the if which he maketh that all which he hath hitherto ſaid hath no greater warrant then his owne ſuretie, which although his authoritie and credit were farre greater then either we haue found it to be, or it can be in it ſelfe, yet were it not ſafe for anie man to relie vpon it, but rather to hould it for verie vncertaine and fayleable. Eſpeciallie conſidering that all which he hath produced in proofe of

diaconos at hoc non eſt iuxta canonem, ſed iuxta hominum mentem Epiph. Hæreſ. 59.

the ſame are either meere trifles, or at the moſt verie poore arguments grounded vpon falſe ſuppoſitions yea and vpon plaine vntrueths, falſifications, and corruptions both of ſcripture and fathers, and ſo partlie through ignorance and partlie through malice he hath shewed himſelfe a moſt partiall and falſe Herold.

And now altho' this might ſuffice for the cenſure of the ſection inſuing becauſe it pertaineth to the ſame ſubiect, yet leaſt the knigth should grũble I will a forde it a Period a parte.

The VII. Period.

IN his eight ſection therefore, Sir Humfrey promiſeth to produce teſtimonies of his aduerſaries touching the antiquitie and vniuerſalitie of the Proteſtant faith in generall. So he proceedeth in the title. To which he addeth by way of aſſeueration that if the Roman Church doth not confeſſe that the reformers are both in the more certaine and Safer waye in the Proteſtant Church, *I will*, ſaith he, *neither refuſe the name nor the punishment due to hereſie*. Heere we ſee the knight is as free in his promiſes as euer he was, let vs therefore examen how he performeth them, for if he doth not, he cannot eſcape either the name of an heretike, or at the leaſt, the deſert of punishment itſelfe euen in this mortall life.

He

Hee beginneth thus. *He that shall question vs where our Church was before Luther, let him looke back to the Primatiue Church: nay let him but looke into the bosome of the present Roman Church and he shall finde that if euer antiquitie and vniuersallitie were markes of the true Church, of right and necessitie they must belong to ours*. So Sir Humfrey. In which wordes as it were by way of generall assertion he briefelie declareth the antiquitie and vniuersalitie of his Church to be found both in the Primatiue Church and also in the present Roman Church, in which assertion there being two partes and that no small ones, the first he endeauoureth to proue by shewing a conformitie betwene the doctrine of the Church of England with that of the Primatiue Church, and descending to particulars he tells vs that his Church teacheth and beleeueth the same three Creedes which were instituted by the Apostles and the Fathers of the Primatiue Church, and not created by Luther: as also two of the seauen Sacraments which were, saith he, by the confession of our aduersaries instituted by Christ. The same he affirmeth of 22. bookes of Canonicall Scripture which he saith were vniuersallie receiued in all ages. Likewise of the seuen generall Councells he affirmeth that foure of them were ratified by the Cannons of the Church of England, and confirmed by act

of parliament, and thus he runneth through the points of doctrine and faith in which they and weagree, adding to them the confeſſion of his aduerſaries. And yet in all his large rehearſall of points of faith, he maketh no mention of eyther thoſe in which the Romaniſts and reformers diſagree, nor of thoſe new articles of the English Creede which diſſent from the doctrine of the Primatiue Church, and which indeede are thoſe that make the reformers guiltie of hereſie, as its the doctrine of Iuſtification by faith onelie, the deniall of the reall preſence and ſuch like: But craftilie leauing them out as if they were not to the purpoſe he treateth, whereas in trueth by reaſon of theſe new errours obſtinatelie defended by them, there can be no vniuerſalitie nor antiquitie in their Church notwithſtanding they had neuer ſo great conformitie both to the auncient primatiue, and moderne Roman Church in all the reſt of their beleefe. Eſpeciallie ſuppoſing that anie one errour in matter of faith obſtinatelie defended is ſufficient to take away all true antiquitie and vniuerſallitie of anie Church or congregation whatſoeuer, as euen the reformers themſelues, as I ſuppoſe, cannot denie, for that, as the ſcripture affirmeth, that he who offends in one thing is made guiltie of all the reſt, ſo he that in one onelie poynt of faith houldeth contrarie to the moſt vniuerſall and

aun-

auncient Church, maketh himſelfe preſentlie guiltie of want or defect both of vniuerſalitie and antiquitie in his beleefe. For as Saint Nazianzene ſaith to this purpoſe in his 37. *oration* towards the end: the articles of faith are like to a gould chaine from which if you take away anie one link (as Saint Ambroſe ſaith) *you take away your ſaluation*, *vnum horum*, ſaith he, *ſi detraxeris tetraxiſti ſalutem tuam.* And ſo we ſee that the knight by reaſon he omitteth in his diſcourſe that part vpon which the verie medium of his argument chiefelie, or at the leaſt greatelie depended, his proofe of antiquitie and vniuerſality in his Church falleth to the groūd. But beſides this defect he fayleth alſo in that he ſaith he beleeueth the three Creedes inſtituted by the Apoſtles and Primatiue Fathers of the Church. For either he meanes that thoſe three Creedes do ſufficientlie conteyne all that he is bound to beleeue or no. If the firſt he meaneth, then what will become of his ſolifidian iuſtification, and of the 39. articles of the English faith, the greater parte of which is not to be found in thoſe Creedes. If he meanes the ſecond, then doth he ill in leauing thoſe particulars out in the rehearſall of his faith. Nay more then this, for if matters were well examined, I doubt not but the knight notwithſtanding the proteſtatiō of his faith of the three Creeds, yet he would be founde holting in the

Ad cap. 9. Lucæ lib. 6. in fine.

true & generally receiued, or Catholike sēse of diuers of the same, as that of the perpetuall virginity of the mother of God, in that of the descēt of Christ in to hell, of the Catholike Church, the cōmunion of Saincts, remission of sinnes, and the like I say of the doctrine of the 4. first Generall Councels, and of the Sacraments: in which particulars our aduersaries vnder presēce of reformatiō maintaine diuers deformed errours, specified and confuted by diuines of the Roman Church. Moreouer the knight is also defectiue in the proofe of the antiquitie and vniuersalitie of his faith, and doth egregiously equiuocate in that he saith that two of the Sacraments which the Church of Rome houldeth, are professed by the reformers and confessed by their aduersaries to haue beene instituted by Christ, not broached by Luther. This I say is equiuocall and doth not prooue his intent: for although it neither is nor can be denied, but ingenuously confessed by the Roman Church that there are two Sacraments, yet doth she not confesse that there are onely two Sacraments instituted by Christ as the reformers professe, but houldeth and beleeueth fiue more as well as those two to haue beene instituted by Christ, which fiue being denyed, or at the least three or foure of them, both by Luther and the rest of the pretended reformers, and on the contrary hauing beene

receiued

receiued for Sacramẽts in aũcient times, as afterwards shall be declared, the deniers of thẽ whosoeuer they be, cannot rightly claime either antiquity or vniuersality of doctrine in that particular. And the same may be said for the same reason of the 22. bookes of Scripture, and the seuen first generall Councells, in the which he saith of the reformers is neither aunciẽt nor vniuersall first for that they hould those twenty two bookes for canonicall Scripture & exclude all the rest out of the canõ, which neuertheleſſe as appeareth by the testimony of S. Augustin herecited in the margẽ, were also canonicall in the auncient Church. And secondly becauſe they receiue but onely foure of those seuen generall Councels, which neuertheleſſe Sir Hũfrey himselfehere confeſſeth to haue beene genenerall by giuing them all that titleas well as the four first. To omit other generall Councels which he & his brothers violently reiect.

And now touching Apoſtolicall traditions Sir Humfrey doth no leſſe plainely Sophisticate then in the former points, for that it is well knowne that the reformers either hould no traditions at all to be beleeued but rely wholy vpon pure or sole Scripture as the totall rule of their faith: or if they hould any traditiõs to be neceſſary yet do not they hould all those which the auncient & now the moderne Roman Church doth hould, and consequently

Totus autem canon Scripturarum in quo iſtam consideratione verſandam dicimus his libris continetur. Quinque Moyſes &c. Tobias, Heſter, Iudith, & Machabeorũ libri duo & Eſdrę duo. Et poſtea. Nam & illi duo libri vnus qui ſapientiæ, & alius qui Eccleſiaſticus inſcribitur de quadam ſimilitudine Salomonis eſſe dicuntur nam Ieſus filius Sciach eos

scripsisse constatisse perhibetur: qui tamé quoniam in authoritatem recipi meruerũt, inter propheticos numerãdi sunt. Aug. l.2. de doct. Christiana. c.8.

sequently their manner of houlding Apostolicall traditions is in words onely, and hath no true discent from the Apostles nor any vniuersality or antiquity at all, as neither hath their booke of common prayer & manner of ordination and vocation of Ministers or Pastours: and so altho' they haue some parte both of the auncient liturgie and also of the Apostolicall mãner of ordination, yet becausse they doe not wholy agree with them, no not in the substance and essentiall parts of the action, that is to say not in the consecration of the Euchariſt, nor in the essentiall forme and matter of order which are the wordes and imposition of hands, they are defectiue in the antiquity and vniuersality of the same in regard that the manner and forme of prayer and administrations of Sacraments which the reformed Churches vse at this present is different from that of the auncient Church, & neuer knowne nor heard of in former ages but broach by Luther and his sectatours, quite contrary to that which the knight affirmeth and indeauoureth to prooue, as by comparing their Church seruice, their booke of common prayer, and of ordination of Ministers with the auncient liturgies, as that of Saint Iames, Saint Basil, Saint Chrisostome and others, doth clearely appeare: as also by confronting the same with the writings of the auncient Fathers and their

formes

formes of administration of Sacraments, by which we shall finde a maine difference betwixt the one and the other in regard that in those auncient monuments of antiquitie, be founde sacrifice, oblation, altar, incense, hoste, chalis, holy oyle, Chrysme and the like: But in the forme of seruice and administration of Sacraments vsed now in the pretensiue reformed Churches, ther is none of this to be found or hearde. By which it may farther appeare that it is no silly or senseles question, as our aduersarie would haue it, to demaunde of the reformers where their Church was before Luther. Becawse it hath nowe beene made manifest that allthough some parte of their doctrine that I meane in which they and the Romanists agree, hath both vniuersality and antiquity if it be considered in it selfe, yet diuerse other points of it hath neither the one nor the other. That which cannot be found in the doctrine of the Romã Church for that allthough it is true that some parte thereof was not expressely definde as matter of faith before the tyme of the later Councells, and sectaries, who by their defection from the euer succeeding Roman Church, and their new errours, gaue occasion of new declarations of some particular points, yet were those neither new in them selues nor first broached & taught by the foresaid councells, but onely they by their authority

rity determined & eſtablished for certaine doctrine that which diuerſe nouelliſts preſumptuouſly brought in queſtion, the ſame neuertheleſſe in all the ages before Luther hauing bene both aunciently and vniuerſally tought, or at the leaſt by many doctours of the Church with out contradiction of the reſt: or perhaps if anie were of a different opinion, it was becauſe matters were not then ſo plainely declared by the Church, and vnder her correction. And ſo the queſtion propoſed by the Romaniſts to the reformers can neither be rightly detorted vpon them, as the knight vainely auerreth, nor yet can the reformers euer be able to anſwer it, as plainely appeareth both by that with hath beene allready ſaid, as allſo by the doctrine of their 39. articles diuerſe of which are not onely new in themſelues and neuer heard of in auncient tymes, but allſo expreſſely broached by Luther himſelfe, and that not only in negatiue but allſo in ſome poſitiue doctrine, as is euident particularly in the point of iuſtificatiõ by faith alone. And hence allſo it is manifeſtly inferred how vntruely the knight affirmeth in his 77. page that noe Romaniſt can deny but that the doctrine of the reformers lay inuolued in the boſome of the Roman Church as corne couered with chaffe or gould with droſſe: for neither is it true that either all the doctrine of the reformers hath beene in the

Church

Church before Luther, as I haue showed, nor yet that any Romaniſt euer affirmed the ſame, & ſo S. Hũfrey deliuereth two falſities vnder one forme of ſpeech continuing the ſame for the ſpace of a whole leafe grounding his diſcourſe vpõ falſe ſuppoſitions, & equiuocatiõs, & promiſing to produce teſtimonies of his aduerſarie the Romaniſts for the antiquity and vniuerſalitie of the proteſtãt faith (he meanes the Puritan faith) in generall, yet produceth not one for the ſame excepting Pope Adrian the 6. and Coſterus and D. Harding in Iewell none of which three authours proue S. Humfrey intent. Coſterus and Harding onely ſpeaking of one or two particular points & that in no matter of faith, to wit aboute the manner of the introduction of communion vnder one kinde and priuate Maſſe into the Church, as their owne wordes declare.

And as for Pope Adrian, his owne wordes truely and compleatly cyted showe him to ſpeake onely of the conditionall adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt in caſe the hoſte should not be conſecrated, and ſo he is here produced by the knight both moſt falſely and moſt ridiculouſly to proue, for ſooth, that the Romaniſts excuſe their abſolute adoration of Chriſt in the Sacrament by that conditionall, I adore the if thou be Chriſt: which manner of adoration neuertheleſſe they neuer vſe but onely in

ſpeciall

ſpeciall caſes of doubt whether the Preiſt performed his office according to Chriſts inſtitution. The Popes words are theſe in Latin. *Concilium Conſtantienſe excuſat ſimplices adorantes hoſtiam nõ conſecratam quia facite implicatur condition, ſi conſecration ſit recte facta &c.* And now let the reader iudge how conueniently they be applyed to S. Hũfreys purpoſe of prouing abſolutely that the Romaniſts excuſe their adoration of Chriſt in that manner. Further more Sir Humfrey doth not adduce any reaſon at all for the proofe of his antiquitie and vniuerſality, but onely vſeth his owne conceiptes cõſiſting mearely in iffes an andes, or conditionall aſſeueratiõs, & thus quite throu' the reſt of his ſection he rides poſte like a man that caries newes of a falſe victorie now and then dropping a lye by the way for the haſte he maketh to come to the end of his iourney, which is nothing els but his owne diſcredit: which becauſe it hath beene already ſufficiently manifeſted I neede not goe to particulars for more proofe of the ſame, eſpecially for that I know I ſhall haue occaſion hereafter to handle more largely all thoſe ſeuerall points which our aduerſary cõgeſteth in this place rather by way of recrimination then of treaty, as that Coſterus & Harding excuſe the cõmunion and priuate Maſſe, the one by ſaying that the cup was not taken away by the commaundement of

the

the Bishops, but that it crept in the Bishops conniuing ther at, which he attributeth to Costerus: the other, that it is throu the negligence of the lay people that they cõmunicate not at euerie Masse, which he ascribes to D. Harding. All which is imposed by the knight vpon those two Catholike authours cõtrarie to their true sense and meaning, for that as it is apparent by their owne wordes which I will rehearse in an other place, they say not those things by way of excuse in regarde they know ther is no need of excuse wher no faulte is founde nor acknowledged: it being certaine to them and all other Romanists that how soeuer priuate Masse, and single communion were at first introduced, yet they are both lawfully practized. And so I conclude this section of his', inroling il with the former censures: or rather I may with greate reason frame a more rigorous censure for it, in regard that the knight hauing promised more then before, yet he hath performed lesse, and hauing vnder the name and punishment due to heresie vndertaken to showe by the testimonies & confession of his aduersaries the antiquitie and vniuersalitie of his faith, & that his way euen by the confession of the Romanists is more certaine then their owne, yet he hath performed nothing but spent his whole discourse in equiuocations and iuggeling tricks,

and

and ſo he cannot poſſible eſcape the ſame ſentence which his owne execration called vpon him.

The VIII. Period.

THis Period ſhall conteine the ninth ſection of S. Hũfreys booke: with though by reaſon of the largenes of it, he diuideth it in to ſeuerall paragraffes, yet becauſe they haue but ſmall ſubſtance in them as he handleth them, though otherwiſe they be in themſelues matters of importance: as alſoe for that his doctrine in te ſame points hath beene already in parte examined & cõfuted, therefore I will not ſtand to make ſo many ſeuerall diſtinctions in the treaty of them as he doth, but reduce them all to one onely period, briefely examining how farre thoſe teſtimonies of Romaniſts which he promiſeth to produce as witneſſes of the antiquity of his owne doctrine, and the nouelty of theirs, doe reach in the particular points of the ſame. He beginneth therefore with iuſtification by faith onely, I ſaith he, *will make it appeare that before and after the conqueſt, the prieſts and profeſſours of thoſe tymes proteſted openly againſt the doctrine of Romish merits preaching ſaluation by Chriſt alone, and with all publikely profeſſed and adminiſtred the ſame ſacraments in the ſame faith and truth which we teach and adminiſter*

Page. 85.

niſter to this day. Thus he proceedeth by way of aſſertion with a promiſe to make it appeare, which aſſertion neuertheleſſe contayning two partes, yet neither of them is true, but both either falſe or equiuocall, or rather partely falſe, and partely equiuocall. The firſt parte is cleerely falſe in of it affirmeth that the prieſts and profeſſours both before and after the conqueſt proteſted openly againſt Romish merits. That this is falſe it is manifeſtly conuinced firſt becauſe all the workes of learned men, and hiſtories both of England and other contries that write of that matter, doe teſtifye that from the tyme of S. Gregories miſſion of S. Auguſtin into England to preach and eſtablish the Roman faith (to omit more auncient times) both the Kings, prieſts, and people as well before as ſince the conqueſt haue continually profeſſed the ſame Roman doctrine which then they receiued, vntill the time of Henry the eight at the leaſt, and among the reſt the very ſame doctrine of merits which now the Church of Rome defendeth. As is diligently proued by the authour of the proteſtants apollogie in the firſt ſection of his firſt treaty the 63. page euen by the teſtimonies of Proteſtants themſelues. And what S. Gregories owne doctrine was in this particular, he himſelfe teſtifieth in his booke of moralls the 42. chap. ſaying that *becauſe in this liſe there is diuerſitie of workes*

among

among vs therefore with out doubt there will be in that diuersitie of dignities, to the end that as heare one doth surpasse another in merit, so there one may transcend another in the retribution. Thus Sainct Gregorie to whose testimonie as I could, if neede were, ioyne the expresse authorities of Fathers of precedent ages for witnesses of the doctrine of merits, as of S. Augustin, Hierome, Ambrose, Hilarie, Cyp. Tertull. and other Grecian Doctours euen till the time of the priuatiue Church: so may the consent of those who succeeded the the same S. Gregory be added for the confirmation of it S. Bernard: to omit other places alledged by me in an other occasion: in his 8. serm. vpon the Cantic. saith. *Omne quod feceris bonum malumne, quod quidem non facere liberum sit, meritò ad meritum deputatur. Concilio Aran. can.* 18. *debetur merces bonis operibus si fiant, sed gratia quæ non debetur præcedit vt fiant.* To which might be added the Councels of Lateran *sub Inno.* 3. *cap. firmiter, the florent. decreto de Purgatorio*, and the late Councell of Trent. Which all teach the same doctrine of merits as our aduersaries cannot denie, to which also might be ioyned all those are testimonies of aũcient Fathers who teach that faith onely doth not iustifie, nor is sufficent to saluation, by all which its manifestly conuinced that the doctrine of iustificatiõ

could

could not be openly proteſted againſt both before and after the Conqueſt by the Preiſts and profeſſours of England, except Sir Humfrey will perſuade vs that the faith of England in thoſe times was different from the faith of all the world beſide, and euen of thoſe who directly ſent preachers for the conuerſion of it from gentiliſme and ſuperſtition, all which being wholely incredible, ſo by neceſſary conſequence is the whole diſcourſe grounded thereupon. Secondly I anſwer that its manifeſt out of the words cited by the knight out of the booke of the forme of adminiſtration of Sacraments vſed in thoſe times (ſuppoſing the booke is authenticall, which neuertheleſſe may be ſuſpected as being being onely produced by Caſſander a ſuſpected authour) there is not any word, ſentence, or ſillable which excludes from ſaluation thoſe merits which the Roman Church defendeth: but onely ſuch merits as either exclude, preſſely exclude the merits of the paſſion of Chriſt and therefore the queſtion which according to the order of that directory the Prieſt maketh to the ſick perſon runneth in this tennour. *Doeſt thou beliene to come to glorie not by thine owne merits; but by the vertue and merits of the Paſſion of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt*: which interrogation as you ſee manifeſtly, containeth an oppoſition betwene

the merits of the infirme man and thoſe of Chriſt, and for that cauſe he calleth them his owne as being wholy wrought by his owne naturall power without the concourſe of the merits of our Sauiour & conſequently in that ſenſe of no force or vertue for the obtaining of ſaluation. That which is yet more manifeſt by the like queſtion inſuing made alſo by the Preiſt to the ſame perſon in this manner. *Doeſt thou belieue that our Sauiour Ieſus Chriſt did die for our ſaluation?* And that none can be ſaued by his owne merits or by any other meanes but by the merits of his paſſion? where you ſee the oppoſition ſtill runneth, and eſpecially heare more clearely, betwixt mans owne merits or other meanes which proceed not frō Chriſts Paſſion, but from ſome other cauſe, not including or depending vpon them as the principall agent of all meritorious operations.

And verily I am perſuaded that the reaſon why in thoſe daies & in thoſe occaſions the formes and ſpeach where ſomewhat different in the matter of merit, from the formes vſed in our times, is no thing els but the differences of errours reigning in the worlde in thoſe times, and thoſe that are now at this preſent defended by the nouelliſts. For the Pelagian hereſie which did attribute ouer much virtue to the merits of man hauing once beene and perhaps ſome requikes of it yet remaining verie rife in

England

Englād whē the foreſaid directory was vſed (if any ſuch there were) or at the leaſt not lōge before, it was neceſſary that in all occaſions humane merits ſhould be as much extenuated as could poſſible be without preiudice of faith in that point. But contrarilie in theſe our daies ſince the publication of the errours of Luther and other ſectaries in this matters, it was conuenient, if not neceſſary, to extoll the ſame merits as much as could be without preiudice to the merits of Chriſt.

Now touching that which is added in the ſecond parte of the knigts aſſertion videlicet, that the Preiſts of former times preached ſaluation through Chriſt alone, it is moſt plainely equiuocall, and in one ſenſe it is true and conformable to the doctrine of the Roman Church in all ages, but in another ſenſe it is falſe and diſagreable to the ſame, it is true that Chriſt alone is the authour of ſaluation and that no other then he can ſaue vs according to that of the Apoſtle Sainct Peter *Act.* 4. *non eſt in alio aliquo ſalus. Nec enim aliud nomen eſt ſub Cælo datum hominibus in quo oporteat nos ſaluos fieri.* Neither *is there any other name vnder heauen giuen to men wherein we muſt be ſaued*: and in this ſenſe and no otherwiſe the Preiſts of England in more auncient times preached ſaluation by Chriſt alone: yet notwithſtanding all this, it is falſe that thoſe

Preists preached ſaluation with an excluſion or deniall of the merits of man wrought by the grace of Chriſt and by virtue of his death and Paſſion, neither was ſuch doctrine euer taught either in England or any other place before the time of Luther, except it were by ſome more aũcient heretikes. Moreouer that which the knight putteth in the ſecond parte of his foreſaid aſſertion, to wit that the Preiſts of thoſe times published and adminiſtred the ſame Sacraments in the ſame faith and trueth, which they (meaning the reformers) teach & adminiſter this day, this I ſay is partelie equiuocall in that he ſaith they publikely profeſſed & adminiſtred the ſame Sacramẽts. For tho' it were true that two of the Sacraments which thoſe Preiſts adminiſtred videlicet. Baptiſme & the Euchariſt, be the ſame which there formers adminiſter at this day, yet it is falſe that the foreſaid Prieſts did the vſe in their time either to profeſſe or adminiſter two onelie, as may appeare by the ſame rituall out of which S. Hũfrey draweth this teſtimonie, in which all the ſeauen Sacraments are contained and appointed to be adminiſtred, if the booke be perfectly published without corruption. Partelie alſo that ſame parte of the aſſertion is falſe, for that it is manifeſt the foreſaid Preiſts did not receiue thoſe two which the reformers hould for Sacraments in the ſame faith which they doe, for

as

as much as the Prieſts mentioned receiued thoſe two in the faith of fiue other Sacramẽts which alſo they beleiue to be ſuch as well as the reſt, ſuppoſing that the number of all the ſeuen Sacraments were then in beleefe and practice as much as now they bee, as both the rituall cited, if it be not corrupted, and alſo the hiſtories of thoſe times can teſtifie, of which fiue Sacraments neuertheleſſe the reformers haue no ſuch faith as they thẽſelues cõfeſſe. To ſay nothing of the faith of thoſe ſame Preiſts in other points of religion, which as it is certaine by the relation of hiſtoriographes, was farre different from the faith of the reformers and practice of their Churches, and conſequentlie it cannot with truth be ſaid to be the ſame. And as for the reſt of the words which the knight citeth out of the ſame rituall, they proue nothing againſt merit it ſelfe but onelie againſt confidẽce in proper merits as appeares by thoſe wordes in particular, *place thy whole confidence in his death onelie, haue confidence in no other thing*, that which is ſo farre from the deniall of merits as that it is counſelled & aduiſed euen by thoſe who are moſt profeſſed defendours of the Roman doctrine in that point as out of Bellarmine and other diuines we haue showed before. Nay and beſides this it is moſt plaine in my iudgment that the foreſaid rituall in certaine other words following Period. 4.

in the ſame place did neuer intend to exclude all kinde of merit from the workes of man performed by Gods grace and aſſiſtance, for that it expreſſely ſaith in the perſon of that ſick man: *I offer his merits* (that is the merits of Chriſt) *in ſteede of the merits I ought to haue*, for if he ought to haue merits as he affirmeth euen vpon his death bed, though he haue thē not, euident it is that he denied not the ſame but plainelie ſuppoſed the truth of them. And thus we ſee that the words of the order of baptizing benigniouſlie interpreted make nothing for S. Hūfreyes poſition nor againſt the Romā doctrine of merits. How be it the ſame was iuſtelie corrected by the Inquiſitors both becauſe the manner of phraſe which it vſeth might eaſily giue occaſiō of errour eſpecially in theſe our dayes: as alſo becauſe it is iuſtelie ſuſpected to be Apochryphall, in regarde it containes certaine ill ſounding ſentēces not onely in the doctrine of the Roman Church: but alſo according to the tenets of the Reformers. As where it ſaith thus. *Theſe proteſtations of ſuch as lye a dying were reuailed to a certaine religious man. And thoſe wordes: he that ſhall proteſt ſuch things as followe, from his harte cannot be damned &c.* All which propoſitions and ſome others are commaunded by the authours of the Index to be blotted as well as the wordes which Sir Humfrey here cites.

And

And yet more ouer it is to be aduertiſed that there is not a worde in all that which our aduerſarie produceth againſt merits which doth proue iuſtification by faith onelie, which is that which he intendes to proue in this place as the title of his paragraph doth declare. And ſo by this meanes he hath quite fled from his text. And ſo this may ſuffice to demonſtrate the falſitie of the knights aſſertion and the nullitie of the proofe thereof by the teſtimonies of his aduerſaries, ſeeing plainelie that he doth no thing therein, but partlie by vntrueths and partlie by equiuocations deludes his reader not citing anie one authour either Romaniſt or reformer in all this paragraffe more then the wordes rehearſed out of the foreſaid Rituall, which neuertheleſſe hauing bene, as ſuſpected of corruption, chaſticed by the Inquiſitours, the vncenſured coppies (which doubtleſſe he and his fellowes onelie vſe) haue no authoritie nor credit in the Roman Church, or at the moſt, verie little, and conſequentlie he proceedeth moſt weakelie in produceing for a teſtimonie of his aduerſarie that which they doe not acknowledge for theirs, eſpeciallie conſidering he alledgeth nothing els for the proofe of his tenet. The ſecond paragraffe is of the Euchariſt and Tranſubſtantiation. *As concerning the Sacraments of the Lords ſupper* ſaith the knight. *In the dayes of Alfrick a-*

bout the yeare 996. There was a Homilie publikelie to be read to the people one Easter day, wherein the same doctrine which, saith hee, our Church now professeth was publikelie taught and receaued, and the doctrine of the reall presence (which in that time had gotte some footing in the Church) was plainelie cõfuted and reiected. The wordes which he citeth are these. *There is a greate difference betwixt the bodie wherein Christ suffered and the bodie which is receaued of the faithfull, the bodie that Christ suffered in it was borne of the flesh of marie with bloud and with bone, with skinne and with sinewes, in human lims, with a reasonable soule liuing: and his spirituall bodie which nourisheth the faithfull spirituallie, is gathered of manie cornes without bloud and bone, without lim, without soule, and therefore there is nothing to be vnderstood bodilie but spirituallie &c. Thus farre out of the homilie. And this doctrine saith the knight was deliuered in those times not by one onely Bishop but by diuerse in their Synods and by them commended to the Clergie, who were commaunded to reade it publikelie to the people one Easter day for their better preparation and instruction in the Sacrament,* and for the same cause translated into the saxon language by Alfrick: and to the same purpose the Knight also citeth two other writinges or Epistles as published and translated also into the vulgar tongue by the same Alfric.

But to this I answer first that whatsoeuer doctrine

ctrine is conteynd in the Hom: & Epiſtles cited, the Romaniſts are not boūd to beleeue it, becauſe the knight onely citeth them out of his owne authours and as printed by the members of his owne Church, to wit out of B. Vsher, and Doctour Iames, and ſo it is both abſurd and impertinent to produce thē as teſtimonies of his aduerſaries, as he profeſſeth to doe in the title of his ſection, eſpecially ſuppoſing that he hath not aledged any one author of the Romaniſts religion where by to proue them authenticall, nor yet any other indifferent witneſſe, but onely thoſe two reformers whom we haue named, whoe by the Romaniſts may iuſtly be ſuſpected of partiallity in fauour of their owne cauſe, eſpecially if we conſider that Sir Humfrey himſelfe graunteth that *the Latin epiſtle written by Alfric is to be ſeene mangled and razed in a manuſcript in Benet colledg in Cambridge.* And certainely the English coppies being found not to aggree with the Latin manuſcript which is either the Originall it ſelfe, or at the leaſt cometh much neerer the time in which the authour of it liued, then any other coppie the knight could poſſible haue, there is farre greater euidence that the latter tranſlations and impreſſions are corrupted by the reformers, then that either the Iudex expurgatorius or any other Romaniſt hath made any alteration or chaunge in the originall coppies or firſt

au-

authenticall manuſcripts, or in any other except it were onely to reſtore them to their prime innocenty and originall trueth: cheefely ſuppoſing that the inquiſitors in their expurgation of bookes intend no other thing more then to reduce ſuch as be corrupted to the former purity of their originalls. Thirdly I anſwer that admitte the editions which are published in England be true and ſincerely tranſlated and printed, which neuertheleſſe may iuſtly be ſuſpected by reaſon of the manifould corruptions found to haue bene vſed in that nature by diuerſe of the reformed profeſſion as by the expurgatory Index doth plainely appeare, the authours of which Index haue diſcouered diuers workes Fathered partely by auncient and partely by moderne ſectaries vpõ thoſe who neuer writ them: which was the cauſe as I ſuppoſe, why Antonius poſſeuinus in the preamble to his ſelect Bibliotheke ſaith that Sixtus, Bellarmine, and others haue manifeſted very maine peſtilent bookes attributed by heretikes to ancient and good authours among which we may number one cited by Sir Humfrey in ſome parte of his worke, intitled *de fiducia & miſericordia Dei*, which Bell. in his booke de Scrip. Eccleſ. declares to be counterfait and ſuppoſitious and none of Bishop Fishers on whom it is impoſed. Neuertheleſſe how ſo euer the matter ſtandes

tou-

touching the truth of the foreſaid homilie, and admit it be neuer ſoe true and authenticall: yet I am confidently aſſured that the wordes by Sir Humfrey cited out of it againſt the reall preſence, are not ſo obſcure but that they admitte ſuch a comodious expoſition as doth not in any ſort fouour the denyall thereof but rather impugne andit confute it. Firſt for that there is not one worde which includeth a denyall of the reall preſence of Chriſts bodie in the Euchariſt, but the wordes onelie showe a differēce betwene the body in which Chriſt ſuffered and the bodie which the faithfull receiue, which difference is not reallie in the ſubſtance of the bodie it ſelfe, it being one and the ſame in nature in euery place where it exiſteth; but onely in the properties and manner of exiſtence, or being in place: it hauing beene in the paſſion viſible, mortall, and with it entire locall extenſion: but in the Sacrament inuiſible, impaſſible, and vnextended: in which ſenſe allſo it may rightly be called ſpirituall: yea and not altogether improperly, eſpecially taking it with a relation or reſpect vnto the ſame body perfectly extended in the manner aboue declared, it may be ſaid to be without bloud, bone, ſinnwoe, limbe, or ſoule, that is without extenſiō or motion of theſe partes, as the cited wordes doe ſignifie, which by reaſon of the foreſaid maner

ner of being of Christs body in the Sacrament doe call it his spirituall bodie, from thence as it were inferring & concluding that noething is to be vnderstood there bodily but spiritually: all which is noething contrarie to the doctrine of the Romanists in this point, but rather most agreeable to the same, which teacheth that Christs body though it be truelie in the Sacrament, yet without extension and not in a Corporall, but in a spirituall manner; yea and very cõformable to the doctrine of S. Paul who speaking of the resurrectiõ of the flesh douteth not
1. Cor. 15. to call one & the same humane bodie both corruptible & spirituall: *Seminatur corpus animale, surget corpus spirituale*, and that not for the difference of the bodie in it nature and substance which it hath not but onelie by reason of the accidentall difference which it hath in it properties and mãner of existence, & which the same bodie receiueth in the resurrection not hauing had them in this mortall life. True it is ther is one passage in the homilie which in my opinion hath more difficulty & showe of repugnance to the reall presence & transsubstantiation then the former wordes, to wit where the authour makes a comparison betwixt the manna and water which flowed from the rocke in the desert, both which he affirmes to haue beene figures of Christ bodie and bloud as the Euchariſt also is. Neuertheleſſe

leſſe he hath conſequenter an other paſſage or two which plainely declare that ſimilitude to be nothing contrarie either to the reall preſence or tranſſubſtantiation. For ſo he addes, The Apoſtle Paul ſaith that the Iſraeliſts did eate the ſame goſtely meake, and drinke the ſame goſtely drinke, becauſe that heauenly meate that fed them 40. yeares and that water which frome the ſtome did follow had ſignification of Chriſts bodie & his bloud that now be offered daylie in Gods Church: *it was the ſame* (ſaith he) *which we offer, not bodily but goſtely.* By which wordes it is euident that Alfric puts a maine difference betwixt that ſpirituall meate and drinke of the Iewes, & the ſpirituall foode which Catholike Chriſtians receiue in the Sacrament, that being but a ſignification, as the authour of the Homilie expreſſely affirmeth, of Chriſts body & bloud, it being the ſame not bodilie but onely ſpiritually or figuratiuelie with that bodie and bloud of Chriſt which he auerreth Preiſts to offer daylie and of which he alſo teacheth the foreſaid water to be a repreſentation, not the bodie and bloud themſelues, which as being euerie day ſacrificed in the altar, euen according to common ſenſe they muſt of neceſſitie be reallie and truelie in the Euchariſt. And altho' the authour of the Homilie calleth it a figure of Chriſts bodie & bloud, yet doth he

not

not say it is a figure of thē absent, as the water flowing out of the rock was, but truelie and reallie present, as those his wordes in which he saith and diuers time repeateth, that Christs bodie and bloud are offered in the same Eucharist by Preists in sacrifice, doe euidently conuince, supposing it is impossible to conceiue the authour of the homilie should affirme that Christs bodie and bloud be offered, in the altar, and yet not beleeue the same to be reallie truelie and substantially present in the Eucharist. Moreouer the same Homilie saith in plaine termes, *the wine which in the supper by the Preist is hallowed, shewe one thing without to humane vnderstanding and another thing with in to beleeuing minds, without they seeme bread and wine both in figure and tast, and they be truely after their hallowing Christs bodie and his blood throu' gostelie misterie.* And afterwardes these wordes doe followe, *we said vnto you that Christ hallowed bread and wine to housell before his suffering and said this his my bodie and my bloud, yet he had not then suffered: but so notwithstanding he turned throu' in visible might the bred to his owne bodie, the wine to his bloud,* which wordes how plaine they be for the reall presence and transsubstantiation, anie one that is not violently partiall in his owne cause may easilie perceiue, considering that for Christ to turne by inuisible might the bread and wine into his

his bodie and bloud, is nothing els but that which both the definitions of the Roman Church and Catholike diuines call by the names of reall preſence and tranſſubantiation.

Thirdlie it is manifeſt that the foreſaid teſtimonie cannot in reaſon be alledged in fauour of the reformers doctrine in this particular, for that they denie the bodie of Chriſt either to exiſt or to be receaued really in the Euchariſt otherwiſe then by faith & figure, neither of which neuerteleſſe is denied by the words aboue cited, but contrarilie they expreſſely and abſolutelie auerre that the bodie of Chriſt is receaued by the faithfull, and altho' they call it his ſpirituall bodie, yet doubtleſſe they doe it onelie for the reaſon alledged as alſo for that it nourisheth the receiuers ſpirituallie, yet they neuer denie it to be a true bodie, or to be trulie preſent in the Sacrament, or affirme it to be receiued by faith onelie as the reformers commonlie doe, and Sir Humfrey in particular moſt expreſſelie in diuerſe places of his booke.

Fourtlie the wordes alledged call the bodie which the faithfull receiue in the Euchariſt a bodie gathered of many cornes, without bloud and bone, without lim, without ſoule. But the reformers profeſſe to receiue no ſuch bodie in the Sacrament, but the verie ſame bodie

which

not say it is a figure of thē absent, as the water flowing out of the rock was, but truelie and reallie present, as those his wordes in which he saith and diuers time repeateth, that Christs bodie and bloud are offered in the same Eucharist by Preists in sacrifice, doe euidently conuince, supposing it is impossible to conceiue the authour of the homilie should affirme that Christs bodie and bloud be offered, in the altar, and yet not beleeue the same to be reallie truelie and substantially present in the Eucharist. Moreouer the same Homilie saith in plaine termes, *the wine which in the supper by the Preist is hallowed, shewe one thing without to humane vnderstanding and another thing with in to beleeuing minds, without they seeme bread and wine both in figure and tast, and they be truely after their hallowing Christs bodie and his blood throu' gostelie misterie.* And afterwardes these wordes doe followe, *we said vnto you that Christ hallowed bread and wine to housell before his suffering and said this his my bodie and my bloud, yet he had not then suffered: but so notwithstanding he turned throu' in visible might the bred to his owne bodie, the wine to his bloud,* which wordes how plaine they be for the reall presence and transsubstantiation, 'anie one that is not violently partiall in his owne cause may easilie perceiue, considering that for Christ to turne by inuisible might the bread and wine into his

his bodie and bloud, is nothing els but that which both the definitions of the Roman Church and Catholike diuines call by the names of reall preſence and tranſſubantiation.

Thirdlie it is manifeſt that the foreſaid teſtimonie cannot in reaſon be alledged in fauour of the reformers doctrine in this particular, for that they denie the bodie of Chriſt either to exiſt or to be receaued really in the Euchariſt otherwiſe then by faith & figure, neither of which neuerteleſſe is denied by the words aboue cited, but contrarilie they expreſſely and abſolutelie auerre that the bodie of Chriſt is receaued by the faithfull, and altho' they call it his ſpirituall bodie, yet doubtleſſe they doe it onelie for the reaſon alledged as alſo for that it nourisheth the receiuers ſpirituallie, yet they neuer denie it to be a true bodie, or to be trulie preſent in the Sacrament, or affirme it to be receiued by faith onelie as the reformers commonlie doe, and Sir Humfrey in particular moſt expreſſelie in diuerſe places of his booke.

Fourtlie the wordes alledged call the bodie which the faithfull receiue in the Euchariſt a bodie gathered of many cornes, without bloud and bone, without lim, without ſoule. But the reformers profeſſe to receiue no ſuch bodie in the Sacrament, but the verie ſame bodie

which

which ſitteth on the right hād of God in heauē indued with all the properties and dimenſions of a true bodie, though by faith onelie; and ſo there being ſuch ſmall affinitie betweene both the words and ſenſe of the foreſaid place and the reformers doctrine in this point, neither S. Humfrey, nor thoſe from whom he receiued it, had any reaſon to produce it as a teſtimonie wherebie to proue their Church to haue bene viſiblie extant, and their faith publikelie profeſſed before the daies of Luther. And from hence we may further deduce how vaine *a flourish the knight maketh* in the end of his 91. page were by way of concluſion he affirmes *that the moſt ſubſtantiall points of his religion were viſiblie knowne and generallie published not in pryuate corners but in publike libraries, not in obſcure aſſemblyes. But in open Churches, and generall congregations of our owne countrye in the darkeſt ages long before Luthers dayes*; All which deduction is moſt friuolous and idle: firſt for that ſuppoſe it were moſt true and certaine that the deny all of the reall preſence were contained in the foreſaid writings, the contrarie to which I haue made moſt manifeſt, yet is it a moſt vaine and falſe brag of the knight to ſaye that therefore the moſt ſubſtantiall points of his religion were viſiblie knowne and generallie profeſſed in his countrie longe before the dayes of Luther, it being

being manifeſt that with all the Arethmatik he can vſe, the whole ſome of ſubſtantiall points of his religion falſelie pretended to be ſounde by him in the foreſaide epiſtles and homilie, doe not paſſe the number of two: whereas yet on the contrarie ther are truelie and vnfainedlie abouetwiſe as manie againſt him and for the Romaniſts, as maſſe, prayers in Latin, water mixed to the wine in the chalis, offering of the ſame, ſacrifice, the pronouncing of Agnus Dei in the maſſe, the ſigne of the Croſſe. As alſo becauſe there are no certaine premiſſes out of which anie ſuch illation of the knights can be collected, but the quite contrarie as hath beene alreadie showed: and ſo for Sir Humfrey to ſay the moſt ſubſtantiall points of his faith haue beene generallie published not in priuate corners but in publike libraries before the dayes of Luther grounding his ſaying onelie vpon the foreſaid writings, is moſt abſurde and voyde of truth. To omit that if as the knight affirmes, there is a copie of the foreſaid Epiſtle mangled in the foreſaid librarie a man may doubt how the pretẽſiue reformers could come by anie more true manuſcript then that razed copie, out of which they could by comparing the one with the other, diſcouer that that which was ſo blotted & defaced, did containe anie doctrine contrarie to the reall preſenſe or tranſubſtantiation or agreeing with

The deniall of the reall preſence and tranſubſtantiation confeſſed by Sir H. to be the moſt ſubſtantiall points of his religion.

their owne copies now of late translated into English and printed by them. And also we may further suspect that the copie which Sir Humfrey mentioneth as mangled and razed, is the onelie true originall, and that the transsumpts of Alstrickes sermon now published in English, are altered and changed from the puritie of their first copies, all which I leaue to the iudgement of the indifferent reader and my owne further examen of the matter as opportunitie shall serue. And yet besides this, I cannot conceiue how this businesse hangs together, to wit that Sir Humfrey produces the foresaid homilie against transubstantiation, and yet the same Sir Humfrey page 98. affirmes that they (I knowe not who) haue in that same homilie suggested transubstantiation by two faigned miracles. Now if in that homilie there be two miracles to proue transubstantiation, as indeed there bee, howe can it then be truly produced by the knight against the same? So that here must of necessitie be some iuggling in the matter. And more, for my parte I cannot possible imagin howe that ould mustie copie of the homilie being in the saxon language could make two such monsterous iumpes as first to leape out of ould saxon in to English, and then out of exiter into Oxon euen iuste at that present time when M. Fox had need of them for the furnishing of his moulie

monu-

monuments. Certainelie I hould this for one of the greateſt miracles that anie of the reformed brothers euer committed. Beſides this in my opinion it ſauoures rancke of forgerie to ſay that the wordes razed in the Latin copie of Alfricks Epiſtle to wolſtan Archbiſhop of yorke were ſupplied by the ſaxon copie of Exiter, as ſome of our aduerſaries doe affirme, notobſtanding others ſay they had the ſupplie from worceſter. And I demaunde further, whether it is not much more probable that the ſentence which he mentioneth if anie ſuch there were in that Epiſtle, was neuer taken away in the Latin, but rather added by Swinglius, Oecolampidius, or Bucer, or ſome other greater Doctour of that potatorie Confraternitie. More D. Iames ſaith that the Latin Epiſtle ſo razed is intituled: *De conſuetudine monachorum*, and yet the ſame Doctour out of Fox relates it to be againſt the bodilie preſence. Now what connexion the bodilie or vnbodilie preſence of Chriſt in the ſacrament hath with the cuſtome of monks, I am perſuaded that, excepting theſe two great Doctours, all the world beſide can not imagin. Eſpeciallie conſidering that in the wordes related by Iames, there is no mention at all of the bodie of Chriſt, but of correction of ſome certaine perſons. And ſurelie Alfrick being an Abbat himſelfe it is to be iudged farre more proper to him to haue

Quibus ſperamus nos quibuſdam prodeſſe ad correctionem, quamuis ſciamus aliis minime placuiſſe: ſed non eſt nobis conſultum ſemper ſi

lere, & non aperire ſubiectis eloquia diuina, quia ſi præco tacet quis Iudicem venturum enuntiet. D. Iames detect. part. 2. pag. 55.

haue writ of things appertaining to the profeſſion of religious perſons, thē of the Euchariſt or tranſubſtātiation, or as they will haue it, againſt the ſame. Finallie Fox referres the tranſlation and publishing of the Homilie and Epiſtles to the yeare 996. Yet Iames affirmes that the Archbishop wolſtan to whome Alfrick writte his Epiſtle concerning that buſineſſe, was a boute the yeare 1054. which yeare differeth much from the other. Wherefore let Sir Humfrey be aſſured that till he cleares theſe difficulties this his new-founde writing caries no authoritie againſt the Romaniſts. And ſo for concluſion of this matter I ſay that till Sir Humfrey or ſome of his companions can produce ſome authenticall authour before Luther who without their owne gloſſes or illations doth teach plainelie theſe negatiues: Chriſts bodie and bloud are not reallie preſent in the Euchariſt: the bread and wine conſecrated by the Preiſt are not turned into the bodie and bloud of Chriſt by vertue of Gods worde and power, let him not trouble himſelfe and vs with ſuch obſcure new founde fragments as this, with which as being ſubiect to diuers expoſitions he fills his owne head and ours with proclamationes neither diſprouing our doctrine nor prouing his owne, and onelie giues occaſion of altercation and expenſe of time in vaine aboute the tryall of theſe his queſtiona-

blie

blie and faultie wares. From hence Sir Humfrey passes to the second parte of his Paragraffe, that is to the doctrine of transsubstantiation in these wordes. Looke saith he vpon their doctrine of transsubstantiation, and you shall see how miserablie their Church is diuided touching the antiquitie and vniuersalitie of that point of faith. Thus the knight.

To which I answer that hauing exactely examined all the particulars which he produces for proofe of this his boysterous affirmation, I finde that as he chargeth most falselie the Romanists of diuision in the doctrine of transubstantiation, so his proofe of the same by authoritie of the authours which he cytes, is also most deceitfull, in regard he produces them as if they disagreed in their faith of the foresayd point, and consequentlie as if euen according to their owne tenets, they had neyther antiquitie nor vniuersalitie in their doctrine, whereas in truth none of the cited authours haue anie disagreement among themselues, but all with one vnanimous consent professedly acknowledge the faith and doctrine of the change of the substance of bread and wine into the bodie and bloud of Christ in the Eucharist, some of them onelie differing aboute the manner of it. Some houlding it to be sufficientlie expressed in scripture, as (vnlesse it be Caietan whose meaning I will ex-

plicate in an other place) all ſcholaſticall diuines affirme. Some others (among which ſcotus is one, or rather ſcotus alone) being of opinion there is no place of ſcripture ſo expreſſe that without the dermination of the Church it can euidentlie conuince, and conſtraine one to admitte tranſubſtantiation in the Sacrament. Others that the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation was held euen in the Primatiue Church, tho' perhaps the worde it ſelfe was not vſed in thoſe moſt auncient times but ſince inuented. But not obſtanding what they held in theſe particulars, yet doe none of them which the knigth cites, impugne trãſſubſtãtiation, or denie that the bread and wine are truelie conuerted into the bodie and bloud of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, but they all expreſſelie auouche, and maintaine it, ſo that a man may maruell where Sir Humfreyes eyes were when he read and rehearſed them.

And as for Cardinall Aliaco, he doth not expreſſe his owne opinion in the wordes alledged by Sir Humfrey, nor yet affirmeth it to haue beene defended by anie authour in his time, but ſaith onelie, *tertia opinio fuit*, the third opinion was. Putting his owne which he calleth *more common*, and more agreeable to the ſcripture and determination of the Church, as alſo to the common opinion of the holie Fathers and doctours: onelie graunting that it doth

doth not euidentlie follow of the ſcripture that the ſubſtance of the bread doth not remaine after conſecration together with the bodie of Chriſt, or abſolutelie ceaſeth: or, that which I rather conceiue of his true meaning, it can onelie be gathered out of this authour (whome I haue exactelie read in this paſſage) that in times paſt there were ſome fewe who, before the matter was plainelie defined by the Church defended that it is poſſible, yea and more conformable to naturall reaſon, and more eaſie to be conceiued, nor were euidentlie repugnant to ſcripture, that the bodie of Chriſt might remaine with the ſubſtance of bread in the Sacrament: none of which is contrarie to the doctrine of tranſſubſtanciation as it is beleeued actuallie in the Church, nor to the vniuerſalitie of her faith therein, ſuppoſing that an act may conſiſt with poſſibilitie to the contrarie, of which nature it ſelfe yealdes infinitie examples eſpeciallie in ſuch effects as depend vpon indifferent or free cauſes.

But not obſtanding this diuiſion of the Romaniſts which, as the reader may eaſilie perceiue, being onelie in accidentall points of this controuerſie betwixt them and the reformers, maketh nothing for Sir Humfreys purpoſe: yet beſides this the teſtimonies which the knight alledgeth out of the ſame authours are ſo farre from proving his intent, that there is not one

of them which doth not either expreſſelie containe or at the leaſt ſuppoſe the trueth of the Roman doctrine in the chiefe point of the controuerſie of tranſubſtantiation, two eſpeciallie that is durand in his Rationall, and Cameracenſis, ſpeake ſo plainelie in that particular of the conuerſion of the ſubſtance of the bred and wine into the bodie and bloud of our Sauiour, that it is to be admired that one of the contrary opinion could poſſible be either ſo ignoraunt as not to perceiue them to be againſt him, or ſo impudent that perceiuing the ſame, he should vēture to produce that which he might eaſily haue perceiued it could ſerue for nothing els but a teſtimonie of his owne confuſion: eſpeciallie conſidering with how ſmall ſinceritie he hath delt in vſing or rather abuſing for the aduantage of his cauſe, both the wordes and ſence of ſome of the foreſaid authours, as appeereth particularlie in the citation of Bellarmin. page 111. where he affirmeth him to ſaye that it may iuſtlie be doubted whether the ſcriptures doe proue the bodilie preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt. In which he shamefullie belyeth the Cardinall, for he ſayth not thoſe words *merito dubitaripoteſt* cited and Englished by the knight, of the proofe of the reall preſence out of ſcripture, of which neither he nor Scotus (of whoſe opinion he there treateth) makes anie doubt at all: but he onelie

ſaith

ſaith that altho' to him the ſcripture ſeemes ſo cleare that it may force one that is not obſtinate to beleeue tranſubſtantiation, yet *merito dubitari poteſt*, it may with iuſt cauſe be doubted whether tranſubſtantiation can be proued ſo expreſſely by ſcriptures as they may conſtreine anie man not refractorie to beleeue it: which are farre different matters as anie one that is not either verie ignorant or verie deſirous to deceiue, may eaſilie vnderſtand.

Secundo dicit Scotus non extare vllum locum ſcripturæ tam Expreſsũ vt ſine Eccleſ. determinatione euidenter cogat trãſubſtantiationem admittere: atque id nõ eſt omnino improbabile: nam etiã ſi ſcriptura quam adduximus videatur nobis tam clara vt poſsit cogere hominem nõ proſteruũ: ta: an ita ſit merito dubitari poteſt, cũ homines doctiſsimi

And in the ſame faſhion, if not worſe, doth he abuſe Maldonate the Ieſuit affirming that he confeſſeth Saint Auguſtin in the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation to be wholie theirs, citing the foreſaid Maldonat's words vpon the 6. chapter of Saint Iohn. the 5. verſe. For the ſame; which although they be truelie rehearſed by the knight, yet haue they no ſuch ſenſe or meaning as he doth either ignorantlie or malitiouſlie ſuppoſe, nor doth he treate in them either of the reall preſence or tranſubſtantiation, but onelie of the expoſition of the wordes of the foreſaid verſe, *Patres veſtri manducauerunt Manna & mortui ſunt, qui manducat hunc panem viuet in æternum*. Making a queſtion whether in them there be made by Chriſt a compariſon betweene the ſeuerall perſons that did eate, or betwene the ſeuerall kindes of breades which they did eate. And whereas Maldonate citeth Saint Auguſtine and others to fol-

follow that opinion which houlds the compa-
riſon to be betwixt the eaters, he with other
authours who liued ſince the tyme of S. Au-
guſtin reiecting that as leſſe probable & more
neere to the expoſition of the Caluiniſts, lea-
neth it ſo, and imbraceth the contrarie: and in
this point onelie, and in this manner doth Mal-
donate perſuade himſelfe that Saint Auguſtin
as a moſt greate enimie to heretiks would haue
bene of another mynde if he had liued in theſe
our daies, and ſeene his owne expoſition of the
foreſaid wordes come ſo neere the gloſſe of the
Caluiniſts. And this being all; yet our learned
knight is ſo curious an Alchimiſt that he will
needes drawe out of Maldonate by arte, that
he confeſſeth S. Auguſtin to haue bene wholie
for the reformers in the doctrine of tranſub-
ſtantiation, and (alſo that which is further fet-
ched) that the Romaniſts haue neither anti-
quitie nor vniuerſalitie in their doctrine. But
alas his worke hath ſucceeded ſo vnfortunate-
lie that inſteede of gould he hath extracted
droſſe, I meane that in lieu of one ſingle trueth
he hath vttered a double lye, falſifying moſt
ſhamefullie Saint Auguſtine and maldonate
both at once, and with in the ſpace of a verie
few lines.

And the like Circulatorie and circumuen-
ting tricks the knight alſo vſeth in the cita-
tions of Alfonſo de Caſtro Gregorius de Va-
lentia

& acutiſsimi qualis in primi Scotus fuit, contrarium ſentiant. 3. addit Scotus: quia Eccleſia Cath. in Concilio Generali Scripturã declarauit, ex ſcriptura ſic declarata manifeſtè probari tranſubſtãtiationẽ. Bell. lib 3. de Euch. c. 23.

lentia and Cardinall Cusanus. As if they did testifie that there is no antiquitie nor vniuersallitie in the Fathers touching the doctrine of transubstantiation, where as in deede they haue no such matter, as appeereth euen out of the verie same wordes which he citeth in this place: Castro onelie affirming that there is seldome mention of the transubstantiation of the bread into the bodie of Christ *in antiquis scriptoribus* in the auncient writers, not in the auncient Fathers as the knight doth falselie translate. And that which is yet much falser, he translates *conuersion* for *transsubstantiation*; where it is also to be noted that Castro speakes there onelie of the worde *transubstantiation* not of the thing signified by the worde, as is euident by his other wordes which presentlie fellowe, saying thus. *Who but an heretike will dare to denie these things because they are not mentioned in auncient Fathers vnder such names?* So that both Castros wordes, and sense are grosselie corrupted by Sir Humfrey. *Valentia* onelie affirmeth that it is not to be marueled, if one or two, or some of the auncients (not Fathers as our aduersarie yet somat more corruptedlie then before traduceth) before the question of transubstantiotion was throulie debated in the Church, haue tought lesse considerateliе, and lesse weigtilie of this matter. In which wordes the knight also translates *palam*, throulie for openlie, and

leauing

leauing vnmentioned the other anſers which *Valentia* giues to the teſtimonies of Gelaſius and Theodoret vpon whoſe occaſion he ſpeakes in that manner, and yet further omitting the concluſion of the ſentence, to wit: *maximè cum non tractarent ex inſtituto queſtionem*; as alſo other wordes which follow to the ſame purpoſe, Cuſanus laſtlie ſaith no more but that certaine of the auncient diuines (if we may giue credit to the knight not heere citing his wordes) are found to be of this minde that the bread in the Sacrament is not tranſubſtantiated in nature but ſtill remayneth, and is clothed with another ſubſtãce more noble then it ſelfe. In which wordes as you ſee, whatſoeuer thoſe innominated men, and as it ſeemes vnknowne to Cuſanus himſelfe, whatſoeuer I ſay they did hould touching the trueth of tranſubſtantiation, yet certaine it is that they were not Caluiniſts in the point of the reall preſence as plainelie appeereth by that noble ſubſtance which they held to clothe the bread after conſecration, which doubtleſſe could be nothing els but the moſt pretious and noble bodie of Chriſt which the reformers denie to be preſent in the Sacrament.

Hæc ergo tam multa & tantorum virorum teſtimonia ſatis eſſe debent vt oſtẽdamus Luthero tranſſubtiationem non eſſe nouã nec trecentenariam vt ipſe aſſerit, ſed multo vetuſtiorum nempe ab ipſis Eccleſiæ primordijs proditam. Caſtro li. 6. hær. 5. f. 178.

This therefore is all that the cited authours affirme. And to omitte that none of them vſeth the name of Fathers as the knight would haue them, tranſlating and transforming

ming the wordes *ſcriptores, veteres, and antiqui Theologi*, or the like, into Fathers, or at the leaſt citing the foreſaid authours as if they ſpake planiely of the auncient fathers, which neuertheleſſe their wordes doe not showe, I ſay, to ſay nothing of this which though it is a trick to deceaue the reader, yet it is ſo poore a one as it cannot much aduantage his cauſe. And to admitte that by thoſe formes of ſpeech the foreſaid moderne authours meane the auncient Fathers: yet doth not this argue want of antiquity or vniuerſallity of the Fathers in that pointe, in regard it is not required to the argument of antiquitie that all auncient Fathers in all ages none excepted agree in the pointe for which that kinde of argument is vſed, eſpeciallie before the matter be ſufficientlie declared & determined by the Church in caſe of doubt or oppoſition of heretikes or otherwiſe: but onely it is required and ſufficient that the moſt parte of them doe conſent therein the reſt not obſtinatelie contradicting the ſame, or carrying themſelues at leaſt indifferent according to the aduiſe of Vincent lyr. *Contra prophanas hæreſ. nouit.* ſaying that, *ſi in ipſa vetuſtate diſcrepantes ſententias reperiamus, ſequamur ſententiam plurium & illuſtriorum Doctorum.* That is, *if in antiquitie it ſelfe we finde different opinions, let vs followe the opinion of the more famous Doctours.* And this is there-

fore

fore true becauſe that if ſuch methaphiſicall antiquitie & vniuerſality were neceſſarie for all points of faith, noe Church in the world could truely be ſaid to haue antiquitie and vniuerſalitie in all points of doctrine or to haue beene alwaies Catholikes, it being a thing manifeſt that not any Church either is, nor was, nor euer will be ſo auncient and vniuerſall as that all and euery one of the auucient Fathers agrêe euer actually with her in euery point, as it is moſt cleare in the auncient Father Sainct Cyprian and yet more cleere in Tertullian and origen, who by reaſon of ſome points of doctrine which either were not in their time ſufficiently and expreſſelie determined by the Church, or of which they had, not occaſion to treate may ſeeme in ſome ſorte to diſſent from the preſent Church euen in ſuch doctrine as now is knowne, and beleeued for matter of faith euen by the noueliſts themſelues, as appeares in the point of rebaptization defended by S. Cyprian & his adherẽts in thoſe times. Which if it were not ſo, its euident, that the reformers were yet in farre worſe caſe then either the Romaniſts ſhould be vpon that ſuppoſition, or then now they are, if in worſe they can be imagined to be, whoe neither haue, nor euer can haue anv kinde of vniuerſalitie or ãtiquity of Fathers either metaphiſicall or morall on

their

their side. And now this being all in substance, are rather more then those three cited authours affirme, it hence appeereth how smale reason Sir Hum. had to cite them in his fauour, especiallie considering that one of them that is *Alfonsus a Castro*, doth onely say that there is seldome mention made of transubstantiation in the Fathers, not denying as it is manifest, their agreement in that point, but rather insinuating their consent therein tho' not so frequentlie expressed. Furthermore the knigth addeth for the conclusion of this pointe that many writers, and schoolemen in their owne Church are so farre from graūt of antiquity & vniuersalitie to this doctrine, that they professe the tenet of transubstantiation was latelie receaued in the Church for a point of faith. And for this he citeth Scotus as affirming that before the counceil of Lateran transubstantiation was not beleeued as a point of faith and that the doctrine of it is not verie auncient in the Church. Thus Sir Humfrey.

Tho which I answer that allthō' Bellarmin affirmes that Scotus sayde transubstantiation was not an article of faith before the councell of Lateran yet I finde he speakes not so absolutely, but at the most he saith it was not solēnly declared as an article of faith before that Coūcell, not denying but that it mīght be also declared in other particular coūcels as in deed it

was

was declared by the Roman coūcell vnder Nicolas the secōd, aboue a hundreth & fifty yeeres before, and more expresselv in another Roman councell vnder Gregorie the seuenth: yea and maintained in the Church time out of minde. Neuertheless by way of argument I am content to graūt to the aduersaries that which Bellarmin affirmes of Scotus: yet not withstanding this liberall graunt, I doe affirme with all that our Church wanteth neither antiquitie nor vniuersality either in this or any other point of her doctrine, and the reason is becaūse although some points of her faith were not in all ages and times knowen expresselie for articles of faith, yet were they in themselues such indeede and for such beleeued with an implicite faith at the least, that is with such a faith as all conteined in the worde of God is belieued by all true Catholikes as an infalible trueth, altho' no one particular were knowne vnto them. For as it is most certaine that euery faithfull Christian which cannot reade beleeueth many things conteined in scripture with he knoweth not, in regard that altho' he is ignorant of them in particular, yet in that he belieueth all that they include, he allso belieueth truely euen those particular trueths which he knoweth not: so allso it is certaine that euery faithfull Christian beleeuing vniuersally all that which the word of God conteines, hath an

Et tunc ad tertium, vbi stat vis: dicendum quod Ecclesia declarauit istum intellectum esse de veritate fidei in illo simbolo edito sub In. 3. in Consilio Later. vbi ponitur veritas aliquorum credendorum magis explicite quam habeantur in simboloorum vel Atha. vel Nyceni: & breuiter quicquid ibi dicitur esse credēdum, tenendum est esse de Substantia fidei, &

an vniuerſall faith of what ſoeuer points of doctrine either was, is, orshall be declared for matters of faith by the moſt vniuerſall Church in any difference of time, and conſequently he hath as ancient, and vniuerſall a faith of thoſe particular points ſo declared as he hath of thoſe which euen both in the Apoſtles time & in all ſucceding ages were expreſſely knowne for articles of faith to all the Chriſtian world. And let this ſuffice to declare that noe point of doctrine definde by the moſt vniuerſall Church as matter of faith conteined in the worde of God, can truely be tearmed new, but hath as much antiquity and vniuerſality as the greateſt myſterie of the Chriſtiã faith,& alſo that if any noueltie it hath, it is onely in the declaration of it, *& quoad nos*; that is in reſpect of that new or expreſſe knowledge which we receiue of it by the propoſition of the holy Church. Which infalible manner of arriuing to a new knowledge of matters of faith, becauſe the ſectaries neither haue it nor admitte it, it neceſſarily followes that whatſoeuer doctrine they diſcouer in theſe later times, muſt of neceſſity want both the foreſaid properties of antiquitie and vniuerſality as we haue declared, in regarde they can not show as much as an implicite perpetuallie ſucceeding faith in the articles they haue newly broched. Sir Hũfrey further more citeth allſo Hoſtienſis and Gaufridus out of

hoc poſt iſtam declarationẽ ſolemnem factam ab Eccleſia.& Paulo poſt. Non enim in poteſtate Eccleſiæ fuit facere iſtud verum vel non verum, ſed Dei inſtituentis. Et ſecundum intellectũ à Deo traditum Eccleſia declarauit directa in hoc vt creditur ſpiritu veritatis. Scot. 4 d. 11. q. 3 in reſp. ad arg.

Durand. in 4. d. 10. q. 1. n. 23. whoe (as he affirmeth) saith there were others in those daies whoe taught that the substance of bread remaines; and that their opinion was not to be reiected, so the knight relateth. But how false and corrupted this relation is I know out of Durand himselfe for that I finde in his 10. d. of the 4. of sent. q. 1. n. 15. that this passage cited by him, is neither Durandes owne doctrine, nor yet theirs whome he cites aboute it, but onely related by them, and taken out of them by Durand to frame his obiection in the begining of his question, as he vseth to doe, which he afterwardes solues in plaine termes saying in his 25. number. *Quod ante inducitur de Glossatoribus Gaufrido & Hostiense super decreta: dicendum quod licet recitent tres opiniones nullam tamen approbant vt veram nisi illam quod corpus Christi sit in altari per transsubstantiationem panis & vini: & si expresse non dicunt aliquam aliam erroneam, non propter hoc non est erronea, non enim sciuerunt omnes passus scripturæ à quibus discedat opinio supra posita sicut ostensum est prius*: And thus the busines being well examined, I say no more but that I ame sorie the worthy knight should be so vnfortunate as to stumble vpon the obiection in lue of the doctrine of the author himselfe. How be it I know it to be a thing so incident to the frailty of other of his religion, that I doe not much admire the case.

The

The ſame Durand is alſoe abuſed by the knight in regarde he produces him to proue that the Roman diuines are diuided in their opinions touching tranſſubſtantiation, which neuertheleſſe I haue showed by his owne words how plainelie he maintaines it. And that which Bellarmin is here cited to affirme of him lib. 3. de Euch. cap. 13. is not that his opinion is hereticall touching the maine point of tranſſubſtantiation, but onely becauſe by a ſingular opiniō he houldes that onely the forme of bread and wine, and not the matter is conuerted in to the bodie and bloud of Chriſt in the Sacrament, which altho' it be falſe, yet doth not the author therfore make anie doubt of tranſſubſtantiation it ſelfe and ſo this is an other of Sir Hūfreyes trickes by which he couſens his reader and iniureth both theſe diuines at once. But put the caſe Durand were truely cyted, yet I ſay as I ſaid before, that a ſmall number of writers againſt the whole torrent of the reſt cannot hinder the antiquitie or vniuerſalitie, either of the doctrine of tranſſubſtantiation, or any other point of faith. And if the antiquitie and vniuerſalitie of Fathers were to be taken in that rigour which Sir Humfrey will haue it, it is manifeſt that he and his conſortes may caſt their cappes at it for any ſuch they ſhould euer be able to finde in their reformed congregations, it being now euident out of the examen

and cenſure of the former ſections, that to ſpeake within compaſſe, they haue not (I doe not ſay the tenth parte in number of the auncient Fathers for the prooſe of the antiquitie and vniuerſalitie of their whole Creede, which the Romaniſts haue for theirs) but not ſo much as one onely authour before Luther, which truely cited and vnderſtood doth defend their doctrine in all and euery particular pointe.

And according to this, I anſwer alſo to the teſtimonie of B. Tunſtall whom the kinght citeth as houlding the point of tranſubſtantiation to haue bene a matter of indifferencie and not an article of faith within leſſe then fiue hundreth yeeres. To which I replye firſt that Sir Humfrey dealeth heere according to his accuſtomed manner that is inſyncerelie, firſt becauſe he produceth this authours teſtimonie as if he had bene of opinion that perhaps it had bene better to haue left the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation vndetermined and free for euery one to vſe his owne coniecture, as in his Phanſie it was before the Councell of Lateran; which is moſt falſe for that the Bishop doth onely relate that as an opinion of ſome others which yet he nameth not, his reſolution being in that pointe farre differēt as his booke teſtifieth in that ſame place. Secondly he dealeth inſincerely in that he taketh hould of that onely which maketh for his purpoſe in

ſome

ſome ſort but, leaueth out not onely that which maketh expreſſely againſt him and for the reall preſence (*quæ fuit* ſaith Tunſtall *ab initio Eccleſiæ fides*, *which was the faith of the Church from the beginning*) but alſo he leaueth out the very reſolution it ſelfe of the authour in this ſame pointe of tranſubſtantiation, where after the wordes by the knight cited, he ſaith expreſſely he houldeth it iuſt for that the Church is a pillar of trueth, that her iudgment is to be obſerued as throughly firme. Adding further that thoſe who contend that, that manner of tranſubſtantiation ought to be reiected (meaning that ſame which the Roman Church both then taught and now teacheth) becauſe the worde is not found in ſcripture, *nimis præfracti iudicij ſeſe eſſe oſtendunt. Quaſi vero* ſaith hee *Chriſtus eo modo illud quod vult efficere non poſſet, cuius omnipotentiæ & ſpiritus S. operationi in totum detrahere ſua aſſertione videntur.* By which plaine wordes of this learned Bishop the reader may plainely ſee how deceiptfullie he is dealt with and how much he is abuſed by the knight. Secondly I anſwer that how indifferent ſoeuer the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation might ſeeme to our aduerſarie to haue beene before the Councell of Latran, neuerteleſſe both this authour and all others truely Catholikes both ſince and before that councell, haold it not for a matter indiffe-

rent, but for a certaine trueth and verity as appeareth planely by that which hath beene ſaid allready in the declaration and anſwer to thoſe teſtimonies which haue in this paragraffe beene produced for the contrary.

Laſtly I anſwer that there was neuer ſuch indifferẽcy in the Romã Church concerning the foreſaid doctrine of tranſubſtantiatiõ, but that ſo manie authours in all ages folowed the affirmatiue, that the reformed flock ſhall neuer be able to show anie for the negatiue, no not one claſſicall authour.

He makes vſe alſo of the teſtimonies of the other. *Durand in the fourth of his Rationale chap. 41. of Odo in Can. d. 4. And Chriſtopher de cap. fontium lib. de correct. Theol. Scholaſt. cap.* 11. *& alib.* who ſeeme to ſay that Chriſt did not conſecrate with thoſe wordes, *this is my bodie*: but by his benediction. But to theſe authours I ſay firſt that whatſoeuer they held in this particular, they all agree in that point which is here in controuerſie betwixt Sir Humfrey and the Romaniſts, that is they all accorde and teach the reall preſence and tranſubſtantiation, and ſo they are all impertinentlie alledged. Secondlie I ſay, that theſe authours diſpute in the places cited, onelie by what wordes, or action Chriſt himſelfe did conſecrate, and not of the wordes of Conſecration by which the Preiſts vſe to conſecrate: And altho' they propoſe a queſtion of this alſo, yet they agree in that the

Preists doe consecrate by no other wordes but those, *This is my bodie*. That which in durand, at the least, is most plainelie expressed when in his page 166. he saith, *Cum ad prolationem verborum istorum, hoc est corpus meum: hic est sanguis meus sacerdos conficiat de consecrat. d. 11. credibile indicatur, quod & Christus eadem verba dicendo confecit*. By which wordes it is most apparent that durand made no doubt of the determinate wordes by which Preists doe consecrate, nor yet was of opinion that Christ himselfe did vse anie other, how be it he relates an opinio of some others which thinke that Christ did not consecrate with those same wordes, but he saith in the opinion rather of others then himselfe) that *virtute diuina nobis occulta confecit*, that he did it by diuine virtue or power himselfe, and afterwardes expressed the forme *sub qua posteri benedicunt*, by which the succeeding Preists doe blesse or consecrate. Now Sir Humfrey in his citation of this authour lefe out the latter parte of his text which doth plainelie declaire his minde to wit the wordes, scilicet *hoc est corpus meum*, which durand includes in the benediction or cõsecration of Christ, chimericallie ioyning to some of the authours former wordes, others which belonge to another opinion related by durand, which houldes that Christ repeated the wordes twise first to giue them power and vertue of confection or

conſecration, and afterwardes to teach the Apoſtles the forme of conſecration, by which the reader may eaſily perceiue that the knight inſteed of making dutand his owne, he both loſt him & his owne reputation by either moſt ignorant or malitious peruerting of that Catholike authours wordes, and ſenſe.

The like to which proceeding he vſeth alſo in the teſtimonie of Odo whome he cites to proue that Chriſts bodie is made in the Sacrament by his benediction, and not by the wordes: *this is my bodie.* For he neither ſincerelie relates, nor trulie conſtrues them. And firſt whereas that authour by may of expoſition of that worde, *benedixit*, ſaith *benedixit, corpus ſuum fecit*, meaning that Chriſt bleſſed the bread, that is to ſay made it is bodie, Sir Humfrey doth English the wordes both with a falſe interpretation of them and a falſe ſeparation ſo: Math. 26. *and then made that his bodie*, adding the worde *then* of his owne ſtampe. Secondlie he makes a falſe conſtruction of Odos wordes in that whereas Odo vnderſtands by benediction conſecration, as diuers other diuines doe, and as it manifeſtlie appeares by his owne wordes vttered preſentlie after, to wit thoſe which Sir Humfrey cytes, ſaying, *virtute ſermonis Chriſti factum eſt corpus & ſanguis Chriſti:* that is, *by virtue of Chriſts ſpeech the bodie & bloud of Chriſt are made:* the ignorant knight imagined that becauſe

becauſe he affirmed before that Chriſt by benediction made his bodie, therefore he made it without thoſe wordes *this is my bodie*: which neuertheleſſe are the verie wordes of benediction or conſecration which Chriſt himſelfe vſed. True it is Odo ſpeakes ſome thing intricatelie and obſcurelie by reaſon of his breuitie, yet thoſe plaine wordes which followe in the ſame place and matter, *videlicet virtute ſermonis Chriſti fiunt corpus & ſanguis Chriſti*, doe ſufficientlie explaine the authours mynde, and ſerue for a cleare expoſition of the reſt, as the iudicious reader of his whole text, will eaſilie perceiue.

Concerning the citation of Chriſtopher *De capite fontium* I ſuſpect there is ſome legerdemaine vſed in it: becauſe it ſeemes not to me a thing credible that anie man of learning, and indgement as he is held to be, ſhould be ſo farre out of tempet as peremptorilie to conclude for an iufallible truth to which ſcriptures, Councels and all antiquitite yeald an vndeniable teſtimonie and conſent that the wordes, *this is my bodie*, are not the wordes of conſecration, how be it the might ſay with the opinion of ſome others that thoſe are not the wordes by which Chriſt himſelfe conſecrated, which point as it is not yet declared by the Church as a matter of faith, ſo neither is it pertinent to the matter we here treat, if ſo it were: as being no

denyall

denyall of transubstantiation, which onelie is here in question and not the wordes of consecration. and consequentlie if that authour (whome I could not haue whereby to examen the truth) if I say he speakes in that sense onelie, then his testimonie was cyted in vaine. As also I may not rashelie auouch that, especiallie if he meanes in the other sense, and as according to their rehearsall of our aduersarie, the wordes doe sounde. That surelie he had tasted of a wrong fountaine when he spoake in such an exorbitant manner, if so he euer spoake.

I haue exactelie examined Card. Aliaco, and finde he speakes in those wordes cyted by Sir Hufrey, onely of the possibility of the coexistēce or presence of the substance of the bread & the bodie of Christ vnder the same accidēts, which possibilitie he affirmes neither to repugne to reason nor to the bible, no more then that two quantities or qualities may possiblie stande together vnder one matter *videlicet de potentia absoluta*, that is by the absolute power of God: which is true in regarde that no text of scripture can be found to such contrarie possibility, nor implicatiō of contradictiō in reason. But all this how true soeuer it is, yet is it out of the purpose and state of our question, which is not about the possibilitie, but aboute the fact of transubstantiation, in which point the resolution of this authour is plainelie for vs saying

that

that altho' it doth not euidentlie followe of the scripture that the substance of the bread doth absolutelie cease to be, nor yet, as it seemes to me, of the determination of the Church, neuertheleſſe becauſe, ſaith he, it doth more fauore the determination of the Church and the common opinion of the holie Fathers and Doctours, therefore I hould it. And this ſame is that which the Councell of Trēt declares: to which doctrine if Sir Hūfrey would conſent as farre as Aliaco, this diſputation were at an end, for that here is nothing els required either of him or any other of his profeſſion but that they obey the authoritie of the Church in her definition.

Sef. 13 c. 4 Secundum hanc viam dico quod panis transſubſtātiatur in corpus Chriſti ad ſenſum expoſitum in deſcriptione tranſubſtantiationis. Alic. in 4. q. 6. art. 2.

In his 111. page the knight proceedes moſt ſophiſticallie in this ſame matter, where, vpon a falſe if, or conditionallie falſe ſuppoſition that neither according to the doctrine of S. Thomas, the Roman Cathechiſme, and the Maſſe-Preiſts, as he pleaſeth to terme them, the conſecrated bread is tranſubſtantiated by Chriſts benediction before thoſe wordes, *this is my bodie*, be vttered, nor by the ſame wordes vttered after benediction, as ſaith he, the Archbishop of Cefarea and others doe affirme; he preſentlie thence inferres that absolutelie there are no wordes at all in the ſcripture to proue tranſubſtantiation for an article of faith: which collection of his neuertheleſſe is no other then to deduce for concluſion

ſion of his diſcourſe an abſolute propoſition from a conditionall and this alſo grounded vpon a meere equiuocation: for admit it is true that the foreſaid authours doe not agree whether determinately tranſubſtantiation be made by the benediction, or by the wordes of conſecration, yet they all accorde moſt conſtantlie and conformablie in this, that by one of the two, to wit either by benediction or conſecration, or at the leaſt by both the one andthe other, the tranſubſtantiation is vndoubtedlie effected, and conſequentlie they agree vnanimouſlie againſt the poſition of Sir Humfrey, affirming *that there be no words of ſcripture to proue the ſame*. And the trueth is that Sir Humfreys captious ratiocinatiō proues no more thē if two should argue, the one that the colour of the ſea water is greene and the other blewe, & that ſome ignorant Cockes-come should ſtep in and tell them that it followes on their variance in opinion that the Sea water hath no colour at all. Which who ſo euer should preſume to doe he deſerued to be ſoundlie hiſt at for his audacious follie, & ſo doth Sir Humfrey.

And as for Biell whome the knight cites ſaying, *it is not expreſſed in ſcripture how the body of Chriſt is in the Sacrament*, he hath indeed thoſe wordes which are quoted by him, tho' not in his 49. as he puts it, but in his 40. lection vpon the Canon: but yet this his

ſaying

ſaying is not contrarie to the Romaniſts who eaſilie admit that the manner of the exiſtence or being of Chriſts bodie in the Euchariſt, is neither expreſſedlie declared in the Scripture, nor yet in all ages, and by all authours expreſſedlie tought in the Church as matter of faith: neuertheleſſe this authour himſelfe in the ſame place addes in plaine wordes, that now that opinion which defendes tranſubſtantiation is receiued by all Catholikes, yealding for a reaſon of the ſame, becauſe (ſaith he) *we ought to hould of the Sacraments as the holie Roman Church doth hould.* And afterwards he addes. *Wherefore becauſe by the determination of the Church conformable to the authorities of the holie Fathers we ought to beleeue that the bodie of Chriſt is in the Sacrament by conuerſion of the bread into it, we are to fee &c.*

And the like I ſay of Scotus, & Yribarne his Scholar, who altho' they ſeeme to diminish the antiquitie of tranſubſtantiation, yet their meaning onelie is that it was not in auncient times declaredlie propoſed by Publike authoritie of the Church as an article of faith: yet both of them expreſſelie beleeuing and defending the ſame profeſſedlie as a matter of faith. And by occaſion of this, I deſire the reader to take notice that whenſoeuer he findes anie Catholike authours to ſay that this or that doctrine was not a matter of faith before this or

that

that time, their meaning is not that the obiect in it ſelfe was no matter of faith in anie one time ſince it was firſt reueiled by God, either expreſſelie in it ſelfe or as included in ſome other veritie, but onelie that it was not expreſſelie and generallie knowne, and beleeued for ſuch by all faithfull people, by reaſon it was as then not declared and propoſed publikelie vnto them by the Church in anie Generall Councell. For that as much as concernes the doctrine in itſelfe, it is no more an article of faith after the definition and declaration of the Church then it was euen before it was ſo defined, as may appeare in the conſubſtantialitie of the eternall ſonne with his eternall Father, in the vnitie of perſon in Chriſt and the diſtinction of natures and the like: which in them ſelues were reueiled verites and matter of faith euer ſince the newe Teſtament and the lawe of Chriſt was published to the world, not obſtanding they were not declaredlie and vniuerſallie knowne for ſuch in a long time after to wit not till the time of the Nicene, Epheſin, & Chalcedon Councels in which they were defined and propoſed for matter of faith againſt the Arian, Neſtorian & Euthycian heretikes. And according to this rule it paſſeth in our caſe of tranſubſtantiation for declaration of which this breefe obſeruation may ſuffice to ſatisfie anie indifferent mynde.

Nowe

Nowe as I ſaid of Scotus and Yribarne, the like I ſay of Caietan cited by the knight out of ſuarez, in his comment. vpon S. Thomas page 108. who altho' in it vpon the firſt art. Of the 15. queſt. he ſaith tranſubſtantiation, which ther he calles conuerſion, is not in the Euangell expreſſelie, *conuerſio non habetur explicite in Euangelio*: and before he ſaith: *we expreſſelie receiued from the Church that which the Goſpell did not explicate*. Yet afterwardes, the ſame authour expreſſelie teaches and inculcates that thoſe wordes: *this is my bodie*: cauſe both the reall preſence and tranſubſtantiation. For thus & addes. *Et per hoc, verba Chriſti: hoc eſt corpus meum: quia efficiunt vtramque nouitatem ſcilicet conuerſionis & continentiæ &c.* That is. *And by this, becauſe the wordes of Chriſt: this is my bodie: doe effect both nouelties videlicet of the conuerſion, and the containing.* By which wordes it is manifeſt what this authours meaning was abſolutelie touching the reall preſence, & tranſubſtantiation; howſoeuer he ſpoake of the manner in which it is cõtained in ſcripture, which is not our queſtiõ.

And in this ſenſe ſpeakes Aliaco when he ſaith, in the place cited by our aduerſarie, *that manner of meaning which ſuppoſeth the ſubſtance of the bread to remaine ſtill is poſsible neither it is contrarie to reaſon, nor to the authority of the ſcriptures &c.* For he meaneth onely it is

not repugnant to anie ſuch expreſſe ſcripture as doth conuince the tranſſubſtantiation plainely to euerie one, without the authoritie and declaration of the Church and therfore he addeth: *if it could ſtand with the determination of the Church*: in which Aliaco showes ſuch obedience to the Church as Sir Humfrey and his fellowes obſtinately denie vnto her; moſt piouſly captiuating his vnderſtanding euen in that which he held more eaſie, and conformable to reaſon, and ſcripture, according to humaine intelligence and diſcourſe.

More euer touching the citation of Bishop Fisher *contra cap. Babyl. cap.* 10. His intent in that place, was onely to proue that meerly by the bare wordes of ſcripture without the traditionarie interpretation of the Fathers, no certaintie can be had in queſtions of controuerſie, or matters of faith. And to proue this (which is a direct concluſion againſt Sir Humfrey and the reſt of our noueliſts) he argueth *ex hipoſtheſi*, or vpon ſuppoſition, ſaying that not obſtanding it is true and certaine that our Sauiour by vertue of thoſe wordes: *this is my bodie*: did make his owne bodie really preſent in the Sacrament: yet if one were obſtinate, ſtanding preciſelie to the pure text without the interpretation of Fathers, and ſenſe of the Church, he might denie, that it doth thence followe that in our Maſſe, Preſts

make

make really present the bodie of Christ. Not meaning to affirme that they doe not in deed (for that the rest of his booke doth demonstate him to beleeue the reall presence in Masse especially the fourth chapter) but onely intending to declare by examples and reasons, that it can not be conuinced that Catholike Prests doe so, by pure scripture secluding the exposition of th Doctours of the Church, and her infallible authoritie. And now this being the true sense of B. Fishers discourse: Sir Humfrey verie coningly, by leauing out the precedent, and subsequent wordes of the authour, so manageth the matter as if he had flatly denied that the reall presence of the bodie, and bloud of Christ, can be proued by anie scripture to be made in the Masse. And that, this is the true meaning of this authour both the title of his chapter out of which our aduersarie taketh the wordes he cites, which is this. *Of the interpretation of scripture by Fathers*. And the whole tenor of his discourse, doe sufficiently declare, so that if the matter comes to scanning, the fraude will easily appeare with shame enuffe to this our professed aduersarie of truth. who not content with this, hath also like a cheating gramster to mende his ill game, dropt a carde, I meane the worde *nostra* which he hath left out in his translation: but this but a pore trick, and so let it passe. And

perhaps it was onely the negligence of the printer. But for the readers better instruction I will punctually rehearse the authors wordes concerning his true meaning, as well those which Sir Humfrey hath omitted for his owne aduantage, as the rest. Thus he saith. *Docea-mus quod citra Patrum interpretationem & vsum ab eisdem nobis traditum, nemo probabit ex ipsis nudis Euangelij verbis sacerdotum quempiam hu tempo ibus verum Christi Corpus, & Sanguinem consecrare, non quod res hæc ambigua sit, sed quod eius certitudo non tam habeatur ex Euangelij ver-bis quam ex Patrum interpretatione, & vsu tanti temporis quem illi posteris reliquerunt.* That is *let vs teach that without the interpretation of the Fathers, and the practise by thē deliuered vnto vs, no man can proue by the bare wordes of the Gospell themselues, that anie man in these our times doth consecrate the true bodie and bloud of Christ, not because this thing is doubtfull, but because the cer-tainetie of it can not be had so much by the wordes of the Euangell, as by the interpretation of Fathers, and the practise of so long time, which they left to posteritie.* By which wordes it is voyde of all doubt and tergiuersation, that the authour of them neuer made question but that true Ca-tholike Prests, as he himselfe was, truly con-secrate, and make present the uerie bodie, and bloud of Christ, the contrarie of which our aduersarie pretendes to proue: onely inten-

ding

ding by this pasage and others to declare against his aduersarie Martin Luther, that scriptures alone without the expositiõ of the fathers and practise of the Church, are not sufficient to conuince the trueth expecially when the wordes are obscure and subiet to diuers senses. And therefore in his page 172. giuing the reason of this, he saith. *Hoc idcirco dixerim ne quis ipsis Euangelij verbis pertinacius adhæreat spreta patrum interpretatione quemadmodum Lutherus fecit, vsum, & interpretationem a patribus traditam nihili pendens, & nuditati verborum insistens, quæ non sufficiunt ad id quod velint conuincendum. Therefore (quoth B. Fisher) I said these thinhs least anie one should ouer obstinately adhere to the wordes of the Gospell themselues, as Luther did not esteeming the vse, and interpretation deliuered by the Fathers, and insisting in the nakednes of the wordes, which are not sufficient to conuince that which they desire.* And in the insuing page he concludeth in this manner. *Therefore that is manifest which afore we promised to show, to wit that long continuing custome, and concording exposition of Fathers none dissenting, doth yeald more solid certainetie how anie obscure place of the Ghospell must be vnderstood, then the bare wordes; which may be variously detorted by contentious people at their pleasure.* By all which wordes it is more then certaine and manifest that this authour neuer inten-

ded to show that the reall preſence of the bodie and bloud of Chriſt can not be proued by anie ſcripture to be made in the Maſſe, as our falſe aduerſarie doth endeuore to perſuade his reader: for he onely affirmes that this can not be conuinced by the bare text of ſcripture without the expoſition of Fathers, if anie contenſious perſon should obſtinately denie it, as his wordes aboue cited, euidently declare.

And as for thoſe wordes which Sir Humfrey quoteſt in his margent which in English are theſe. *Neither is there anie worde put there by which the verie preſence of the flesh, and bloud of Chriſt may be proued in our Maſſe*: I ſay that he dealeth not honeſtlie in the recitall of them in regarde he omittes the next wordes following, not obſtanding they belong to te integritie of the ſame diſcourſe, and alſo are a plaine explication of the former as the reader of the whole diſcourſe may more clearely vnderſtand, the wordes being theſe. For altho' (ſaith he) Chriſt made his flesh of the bread, and his bloud of the wine, it doth not therfore follow by virtue of anie worde here ſet downe, that we as often as we attempt the ſame, doe effect it. In which as the reader may plainely perceiue, the authour abſolutelie affirmeth not that Preiſts doe not effect that which Chriſt effected concerning the reall preſence

of

of his bodie and bloud in the Eucharist, but onely saith *there* (that is among the wordes of the institution of the Sacrament as they are related, by S. Math. and in which those wordes: *doe this in remembrance of me*, are not contained) there is not anie worde by virtue of which the same can be concluded of Preists which is ther affirmed of Christ our Saviour: yet not denying, but expresselie auerring that by other wordes of the scripture, and particularlie by those wordes rehearsed by S. Luke, and S. Paule: *doe this in remembrance of me*: interpreted according to the exposition, and practise of the auncient Fathers, the making of the reall presence of Christ in the Sacrement is firmelie proued, and established. And hence it is that after he had vttered those wordes which Sir Hũfrey also citeth, tho' not intirely; to wit *non potest igitur probari, per vllam scripturam*, it can not therfore be proued by anie scripture that either laie man or Priest, as often at he shall make triall of the busines, shall in like manner make the bodie and bloud of Christ of bread and wine, as he him selfe did, since that, neither this is contained in the scripture: immetiatelie after this I say, he subioines for conclusion of his discourse, this insuing clause. *By these things I think no man will be ignorant, that the certaintie of this matter* (the faith of consecration, as the note in

his margen doth declare) *doth not ſo much depende vpon the Ghoſpell, as vpon the vſe, and cuſtome, which for the ſpace of ſo manie ages is commended vnto vs by the firſt Fathers themſelues. For it ſeemed to them, the holie Ghoſt teaching, ſo to interpret this parte of the Euangell, and iudged it was ſo to be vſed in their times : that whoſoeuer now would introduce, either an other ſenſe, or an other vſe, he should vtterlie reſiſt the holie Ghoſt, by whoſe inſtinct, the former Fathers did deliuer this rite, and ceremonie, in the conſecration of the Euchariſt.* Thus plainelie doth Bishop Fisher explicate his owne meaning in that which he had before deliuered ſomat more obſcurelie; ſo that now I doubt not but this will be ſufficient to make the reader capable of the authours true ſenſe, in which I was forced to inlarge my ſelfe more then the ſubſtance of the matter required, the more plainelie to diſcouer vnto him the fraude of the aduerſarie both in detorting the ſenſe, and mangling the tenor, or continuation of the text of this moſt Catholike, and renowned Prelate.

Moreouer Sir Hũfrey allegeth S. Thomas *in* 3. *par.* q. 75. ar. 7. as alſo the Romã Catheciſme at randome. as affirming that the ſubſtance of the bread remaines till the laſt worde of the conſecration be vttered. But this is nothing to the preſent purpoſe in reſpect that how long ſouer

the

the substance of the bread remaines, if at length it ceaseth as they both confesse, they both agree with vs Romanists and not with the nouellists, in the faith of transubstantiation so professedly, that it was more then ordinarie impudencie, and madnes once to mentione them for the contrarie.

Now for cõclusion of the secõd paragraffe of his 9. section, Sir Humfrey affirmes in his 115 p. out of Bell: and Suarez, that manie writers in our Roman Church professe the tenet of transubstantiation was lately receiued for a point of faith. Which affirmation neuertheless is not iustifiable, but false, and calumnious to the authours he cyteth for it, videlicet Scotus, Durand, Tunstal, Ostiensis, and Gaufridus. Which being all the Romanists he either did or could produce (supposing Erasmus whome he likewise alledgeth, is no Romanist in much of his doctrine, in what faith soeuer he ended his life, of which, I am not able to iudge) yet none of these Romanists I say euer affirmed the doctrine of transubstantiation to be no point of faith, as I haue aboue sufficiently declared in my answer to euerie one of their testimonies in particular.

And touching Bellarmin and Suarez the one being alledged by our aduersarie as affirming Scotus to haue said, that the doctrine of transubstantiation, was not *dogma fidei*, a decree of

faith before the Councell of Lateran: the other as aduising to haue him, and those other schoolemen corrected, who teach that the doctrine of transubstantiation is not verie auncient. I professe I haue diligentlie read Scotus in this matter, and I finde he onelie saith, that what soeuer is auerred to be beleeued in the Councel of the Lateran *capite firmiter*, is to beheld *de substantia fidei* as of the substance of faith after that solemne declaration: yet he in no place hath this negatiue: transsubstantiation was not a point of faith before that Councel, notobstanding our aduersaries allegation to the contrarie out of the Cardinal, who, if he conceiued right of his whole discourse, could not iudge Scotus to haue absolutelie denyed transubstantiation to haue beene a point of faith in it selfe, as Sir Humfrey will haue it: but at the most *quoad nos*, or in respect of our expresse and publike faith of the same. For that some of Scotus his owne wordes plainelie importe that trānsubstantiatiō is included in the institution of the Eucharist, howe be it, it was not explicitly or expresselie declared for such in all ages, before the solemne declaration, as he termeth it, made in the Generall Councel of Lateran.

Scot. d. 11. q. 3. ad ar. The wordes of Scotus to this sense and purpose are these. *Non enim in potestate Ecclesiæ fuit facere istud verum vel non verum, sed Dei in-*

institutentis. Et secundum intellectum à Deo traditum Ecclesia explicauit, directa in hoc vt creditur spiritu veritatis. That is. *For it was not in the power of the Church to make this* (the point of transsubstantiation) *true, or not true, but of God the institutour: And according to the vnderstanding deliuered by God, the Church did explicate it, directed, as it is beleeued, by the spirit of trueth.* By which ratiocination or discourse, of Scotus, it is most cleare and apparent that the point of transsubstantiation was in it selfe a matter of faith euer since the Sacrament was instituted by Christ, in regarde that it being now a point of faith, it must of necessitie in substance haue beene ordained for such by God himselfe, for that it is not in the power of the Church to make, but onelie to declare, and propose to beleeuers, the articles of Religion. And according to this, I say, that Suarez (sauing the due respect I owe vnto them both) had yet lesse reason then Bellarmin had concerning Scotus: to taxe the same Scotus and some other diuines, as if they had tought that the doctrine of transsubstantiation is not verie auncient. For neyther Scotus as his wordes which I haue related doe testifie, nor anie other approued diuine of the Roman Church, doe vse anie such manner of speech, or at the least haue no such sense in their wordes, as euen by all those their seuerall passages which our aduersarie could alledge,

alledge, doth manifeſtlie appeare. How be it ſome of them haue not omitted to ſay, that the worde tranſſubſtantiation hath not beene auncientlie vſed in the Church, but eyther inuented by the Fathers of the Lateran Councel, or not long before: or at the moſt, that there haue beene ſome in the world of a contrarie opinion to the trueth of tranſſubſtantiation in itſelfe: which altho' we Romaniſts should graunt to be true; yet doth it not argue anie noueltie in the doctrine, but rather the noueltie of ſome fewe extrauagant wits, as heretiks or corrigible Catholikes, in oppoſing the ſame, which otherwiſe was generallie maintained by the reſt of the Orthodox diuines in all ſucceeding ages: the antiquitie of which doctrine, euen thoſe ſame authorities which the ſame Scotus himſelfe profeſſeth to be produced by him out of S. Ambroſe, to the number of 11. doe euidentlie conuince, yet further adding that manie others are alledged cap. de conſecrat. and by the maſter in his 10. and 11. diſtinction. Wherefore in my opinion both Bellarmin and ſuarez might much better haue ſpared to paſſe their cenſures in that manner vpon anie Catholike diuines ſuppoſing ſuch reprehenſions ſerue for little or no other vſe, then to aforde our aduerſaries the noueliſts newe occaſion and matter of contention without eyther neceſſitie or conuenience, of which

Scot. d. 11. queſt. 3. §. quãt. ergo.

the

the preſent fact of Sir Humfrey lind euen in this place, doth alreadie yealde vs ſome experience.

In the laſt place the knight citeth for his tenet Eraſmus but he might haue ſaued the labour for that the Romaniſts hould him abſolutely for none of theirs (as in like manner neither doe they acknowledge wicklif and the waldenſians which neuerteleſſe he was not ashamed to produce for his tenet though onely by waye of omiſſion) howbeit in this particular Eraſmus onely affirmeth that it was late before the Church definde it, which is not contrarie to the certainetie of the doctrine in it ſelſe, but onely a ſuperficiall relation of the time when it was declared expreſſely for a matter of faith or infalible trueth in that nature.

And now of this and the reſt of the teſtimonies which haue beene diſcuſſed iu this paragraffe which if it had not beene for the ſatisfaction of the common people which may eaſily be deluded by them I would neuer haue proſecuted ſo largely, as containinge noething worthie of a ſcholers labour: it may I ſay be eaſily collected and perceiued how fondly he concludeth his whole diſcourſe as if he had made it appeare that the reformed faith touching the ſpirituall and ſacramentall participation of Chriſts bodie, had beene generally beleeued and taugh both in the

the former and later ages, and as if the doctrine of transſubſtantiation had noe vnity among the Romish authours, nor vniuerſalitie among the auncient Fathers, nor certainety in the ſcriptures. This I ſay is a moſt impudent vaunt of the bragadocho knight, for that it hath beene already made manifeſt by the ſame teſtimonies which he produceth againſt the Roman doctrine, that not onely the antiquitie and vniuerſalitie of the ſame in thoſe two points ſtands firme and ſound, but that there is no antiquitie or vniuerſalitie at all to be found in the doctrine of the reformed Churhes in thoſe particulars: to ſay nothing of other points of theit deformed faith, and ſo this shall ſuffice for the cenſure of this paragraffe which as it is larger in wordes then the former ſo deſerueth it a larger ſentence of condemnation as conteining noething more but a greater multitude of diuerſe ſorts of ill proceeding.

The third paragraffe is of priuate Maſſe in which for the honour as I ſuppoſe which he beareth towards the mother Church he placeth her definition in the firſt ranke, and then afterwardes the article of his owne Church. The decree of the councell of *Trent. ſeſ.* 22. *can.* 8. is this. *If anie ſhall ſay that Maſſes in which the Prieſt alone doth communicate are*

vnlaw-

vnlawfull and therefore ought to be abroga-red, let him be accurſed, but the article of the reformed Church will not haue it ſo, but proteſteth that priuate Maſſes that is the receauing of the Euchariſt by the Prieſt alone with out a competent number of communicants is contrarie to te inſtitution of Chriſt and the practiſe of the primatiue Church. Thus the knight ſetteth downe the matter of diſputatiõ, thus he placeth the two armies in battle aray with their contrarie collours one confronting the other.

And this ſpeciall difference I note in them, that the one armie conſiſts of *milites veterani* that is of ould Roman ſouldiers gathered out of the whole Roman Empire and Chriſtian world, the other of fresh men fetched from a corner of the world that is from Ireland. Loe heere the armies ſet in order, now let vs ſee who carries away the victorie. You may perceiue by Sir Humfreys relation that the Councell ſpeaketh with authoritie, it intimateth thoſe aged Synods of the primatiue Church, it doth ſo fulminate that it maketh the reformed brothers tremble to heere it. Naye it ſeemes it ſo dauntteth the valiant knight that he found no other refuge then to flie to Irelãd for an article of his faith. A man would rather haue expected that to confront the Councell of Trent and it defi-

nition,

nition, Sir Humfrey would haue had recourſe to the Councell of Gapp. or of Dort, or to ſome conſiſtorie aſſemblie of Geneua, or to an Acte of an English Parleament. But alas the poore Cauelier found ſo small hope of aſſiſtance in theſe, that he was conſtrained to ſaile to Ireland for an Irish article as he himſelfe doth tearme it. True it is the Irish article directlie oppoſeth the definition of the Councell, but by what authority I know not, yet certaine it is that in the Coūcell of Trent there were aſſembled by themſelues or their legates, or at the leaſt conuented, all the Princes both of the ould and newe Religion, and Prelates of the Chriſtian world, as the Bull of indiction, and the oration had in the laſt ſeſſion moſt plainelie teſtifie. And ſo the authoritie of this Synod euen in common ſenſe muſt needes be verie great: but the authoritie of the articles which our knight oppoſeth to the Councell, what authoritie they had, is yet vnknowne: neither could they poſſible haue anie authoritie of greate moment, for that they were gathered onelie out of a verie small corner of the Chriſtian world, and farre inferiour in vertue, learning, and other naturall parts to the moſt greate, graue and venerable number of the members of the foreſaid Synod. Wherefore let the indifferēt reader iudge whether of theſe two armies is to be followed. The authours of the article proteſt that priuate Maſſe is contra-

rie to the institution of Christ and the practice of the Church, and hence the knight inferreth that it is vnlawfull and therefore to be abrogated: and farther that the Councell of Trent by cursing those who hould that masses in which the Priest alone doth comunicate are vnlawfull and ought to be abrogated, doth curse Christ that ordeined it and God that commaunded vs to obserue it. Heere you see the knight talketh with as greate authoritie as if he were the greatest graduate, either in Oxford or Cambridge, nonertheless he must giue him leaue who is no graduate to let him knowe that he fayleth mightilie in his colection, yet not so much in the gradation it selfe as in the premisses, which being either false or at the least equiuocall, the conclusion must of necessitie be faultie. That which deceiued him is his Irish article of faith in that it affirmeth the receiuing of the Eucharist without a competent number of comunicants, is contrarie to the institution of Christ. For though it is true that when Christ instituted the Sacrament, he did actuallie comunicate those that were present, yet it is not true that he included in the institution of it that iust so in all occasions it should be practized, neither gaue he anie negatiue precept therein in that respect, but onelie an affirmatiue which according to it nature, not allwayes but onelie according to time, place, and persons,

obled-

obledgeth. So that the distribution is neither anie essentiall parte of the Sacrament, nor yet anie necessarie propertie of it to be in all occasions exercised, but rather appertaineth onelie to the due administration of it according to the foresaid circumstances: and heerein consists the æquiuocation of the first article.

Now touching the second part which affirmeth that the receiuing of the Priests alone is cõtrarie to the practice of the primatiue church, is also equiuocall, for if it meanes that the primatiue Church did in all circumstãces of time, place, and persons, practice the same either by virtue of Christs institution or commaund, so it is false as we haue alreadie showed: but if it meanes onely that indeede so it was practized in the primatiue Church either alwaies, or for the moste parte, yet not as a thing absolutely necessarie either by virtue of Christs institution or precept, so we cannot deny but that it is true which the second parte of the article affirmeth, but then this being a matter in this sense either of indifferencie or at the most of greater merit and perfection, it might lawfully be altered by an introduction of the contrarie custome or practise of the Church, especially the communicating or not communicating of the auditours of euerie Masse being a thing wholelie depending vpon the deuotion of the people themselues. Which deuotion al-

although the Church could haue desired it had continued in the same feruour in which it was in those primitiue times, neuertheless ther was no reason why either she should obledge the people to the same, or yet that the Preist for want of deuotion in the people, should omitte his owne, and cease to exercise so high and profitable a function to the members of the whole Church as is the publique liturgie and common praier of the same. And truelie this is a matter so conformable to reason and pietie that if it were not that our aduersaries are quite possessed with a spirit of cõtradiction they would neuer contend so much aboute it as they doe, Especially supposing that of all points of controuersie betweene them and vs that is of the least moment, and a thing for which they haue the smalest reason to striue as well because they themselues reiect all sorts of Masses as vaine and superstitious whether they be priuate or publique, with communion of the people or without: as also because euen they themselues after their newe manner celebrate their owne liturgie as they call it, oftentimes yea most ordinarily not onely without the comunion of the people, but euen without the comunion of either Priest or clarke, as is euident by the most common practise of all the reformed Churches, which onely with a drie fothering passe the greater part of the

sũdaies of the whole yeere. And yet theſe ſame Zealous brothers are ſo Croſſe in their proceedinge that they are not ashamed to reprehend in vs the ſame which they thẽſelues ordinarily practiſe in a much worſe manner. In regard of which prepoſterous dealing of theirs in my opinion we may not vnaptlie applie vnto them the ſaying of a certaine ingenious Proteſtant in his deſcription of a Puritan, to wit that they are become ſo croſſe in their teaching, that he thinkes verily, that if the Roman Church should inioyne the puting on of cleane shirts euery ſunday, rather then obey her precept, they would goe lowſie.

Ouerb. Caract.

But beſides this Sir Humfrey for the proofe of his Irish faith alledgeth ſcripture out of S. Matth. 26. Marke 14. Luke 22. but the wordes he citeth doe not argue Chriſts inſtitutiõ in both kindes in reſpect of all ſortes of people, but onely his action, manner of adminiſtration, not his ordination. We know, as well as the reformers Chriſt did comunicate his bodie and bloud to all his diſciples there preſent at the inſtitution of the Sacrament, euen to the traitour Iudas as many deuines doe hould; but we know withall he did not ordeine it ſo to be adminiſtred in all occaſions. Neither doe we finde one worde of commaund in the whole bible by virtue of which the Prieſts are inioined to celebrate this miſterie alwayes iuſt

Accepit Ieſus panem benedixit dedit diſcipulis ſuis, & dixit accipite & manducate.

in the ſame manner that Chriſt did: And otherwiſe if we ſhould be ſo tied to euery circumſtance which Chriſt himſelfe vſed and particularie to giue the communion to all that are preſent, we ſhould be bound to giue it to thoſe alſo which we know are vnprepared for it, nay euen to excommunicated perſons and to ſuch traitors as Iudas. That which neuertheleſſe I perſuad my ſelfe the moſt pure preciſian of them all will ſcarſely doe, though otherwiſe I hould thē not for very ſcrupulous in that nature ſo they know the receiuers to be mēbers of their cōgregation. And touching the foreſaid citation out of the Euangeliſts, it is to be noted that becauſe Sir Hum. will not haue his reader heare of the conſecration of the Sacrament which the reformers neuer vſe, in their Churches, therfore he left out the wordes, *and he bleſſed it*, puting onely the wordes of thākes giuing, whereas yet the greeke εὐλογεῖν ſignifies both bleſſing and giuing thankes, & therefore when our Sauiour multiplied miraculouſly the fiſhes Luc. 9. the Euangeliſt ſaith εὐλογησεν αὐτούς he bleſſed them.

The knight alſo citeth a place of S. Paule 1. Cor. 11. But the Apoſtle indeed reprehendeth there the fault of the richer Corinthians in that they did exclude or at the leaſt not expect the poorer ſorte to eate the vſuall ſupper with them, when they met to gether to

receiue the blessed Sacrament, but giueth no precept to them that all that are present should euerie time they did meete in the Church actually receiue the communion, with the Preist: or that the Preist ougth not in anie case to celebrate without a competent number of communicants, which is our question in this place: but at the most S. Paule there ordaines that when the people comes together to eate either the vsuall and common supper, or the bodie and bloude of Christ in the Sacrament, they vncharitablie exclude not or preuent one an other, but expect, and doe it with order and sobrietie, and like brethren together, without scisme or separation: and as Christ himselfe did who imparted his supper most louinglie to his disciples there present without exception of persons: to which altho' I admit the same S. Paule in parte alludes in his first verse of this chapter; saying: *be you followers of me as I also of Christ*, yet not in that sense as if he had persuaded the Corinthians that our Sauiour commaunded that the Eucharist should neuer be celebrated by the Preist alone with our receiuers, as our aduersarie foundlie infers for profe of the article he opposeth to the Councell of Trent. Neyther is the doctrine of that article in anie sorte fauoured by S. Augustin in his 118. Epistle cited by Sir Humfrey: he onelie there affirming at the most that the Apostle

spea-

ſpeaketh of the Euchariſt, when he ſaith thoſe wordes: *Propter quod fratres cum conuenitis ad manducandum inuicem expectate. &c.* That is in English: Therefore my brethren, when you come to eate, expect one an other &c. Which wordes eyther of S. Auguſtin, or thoſe of the Apoſtle, are not contrarie to the celebration of priuate Maſſes except it be in the imagination of the Nouelliſts, as I haue ſufficientlie aboue declared: To omit that the greater parte of diuines both auncient & moderne, expounde not thoſe wordes of S. Paule rather of the Euchariſt but of the common ſupper, the trueth of which expoſition the text itſelfe, in my iudgemēt, doth plainely conuince. Yet not to ſtand vpon this it is ſufficient for the defence of the doctrine of the Councell of Trent, in this particular and confutation of the contrarie poſition, that neyther in the cited place of S. Paule, nor in anie other place of ſcripture, priuate communion, or receiuing of the Preiſt alone without other cōpanie, is affirmed to be repugnant to Chriſts inſtitution: nor condemned as vnlawfull eyther by Sainct Auguſtin or anie other Orthodox writer.

But yet I muſt further aduertiſe the reader that I perceiue Sir Humfrey hath not dealte ſo faithfully as he ought to haue, in his recitall of S. Paules wordes, putting in by parentheſis and in the ſame letter thoſe (*to eate the lords ſup-*

per) which wordes neuertheleſſe S. Paule hath not, at the leaſt in that place, and then omiting the firſt wordes of the next verſe he connecteth them with the latter parte of the ſame verſe, to wit: *that you come not together to iudgement*. Procuring by this fraude to perſuade his reader that thoſe wordes containe the penaltie due to thoſe whoe communicate not with the Preiſt and the reſt of the people which directly they doe not, but rather the punishment amenaced by the Apoſtle to ſuch as by excluding vncharitably ther fellowes from participation of the oblations, or common ſupper then vſed in the Church, and by other abuſes and ſinnes mentioned in this Epiſtle, indignelie receiue the bodie, & bloud of Chriſt in the Euchariſt.

And yet not to ſtand vpon theſe particular circumſtances, certaine, it is that none of them could yeald anie warrant at all for Sir Humfrey to alter the tenour of the Apoſtles wordes either by addition, or tranſpoſition of them.

Sir Humfrey addeth alſo that Sainct Paule 1. Cor. 10. calleth the Euchariſt the communion. But he might haue ſaued labour in citing ſcripture, the commonly receiued phraſe both by vs and them being ſufficient to prooue that. And yet he might much better haue ſpared the interpretation of the worde it ſelfe

ſelfe for whether his etimology be true or falſe, which I will not ſtand to examen, certaine it is that no iudicious man can thence inferre that all the people preſent at Maſſe muſt of neceſſity communicate, but it onely foloweth that when they actually receiue the Sacramēt, they receiue the Communion as a common vnion not onely of Preiſt & people but alſo and cecfly of the people among themſelues, according to the wordes of the ſame Apoſtle in his next chapter and 33. verſe *cum conuenitis, when you come together to eate expect one an other &c.*

And much like as he did proceede in the former place of S. Paule, ſo doth he in this: *The cup of bleſsing which we bleſſe, is it not the communion of the bloud of Chriſt?* Where for, *communication* he puts *communion.* And yet the ſcope and ſenſe of the Apoſtle in this place is not of the communion of Preiſt and people, nor preſcribes he anie rule in that nature, but onelie reprehendes thoſe who voluntarily and without ignorance eate idolothytes or meates ſacrifyced to Idols, ſaying that as thoſe who receiue the bodie and bloud of Chriſt comunicate or are ioyned in ſocietie with him: ſo they who of knowledge eate things offered to Idols are made companions of the deuill. And therefore the ſame Apoſtle in the latter parte of his 20. verſe ſaith thus. *And I will not haue you become fellowes to deuils.* And preſentlie in the

next verſe he addes: *You can not drinke the chalis of our Lord, and the chalis of deuils.* So that the whole tenour of the chapter afordeth not a worde or letter for Sir Humfreyes purpoſe. Wherefore let him examen his conſcience diligentlie, and he will eaſilie finde that neyther the one place not the other proue anie thing elſe in this matter then his owne dishoneſt dealing, and his abuſe of the ſacred text of ſcripture. Eſpeciallie conſidering that in the firſt place, the Apoſtle reprehendes not the Corinthians ſo much becauſe they did not communicate together, but cheefelie becauſe the rich did vnchriſtianlie exclude the poore. Which caſe as the reader may eaſilie perceiue, hath no place in the Maſſes of the Roman Church, where none are excluded but rather expreſſelie exhorted vnto the communion, as the verie ſame decree of the Tridentine Councel which our aduerſarie him produces, doth ſufficientlie declare in theſe wordes. *Optaret quidem ſacroſancta Synodus &c. The Sacroſaint Synod could wish that the faithfull people which aſsiſte at euerie maſſe would communicate with the Preiſt, not onelie ſpirituallie, but alſo by Sacramentall reception.* Thus the Councel. Which wordes alone doubtleſſe were ſufficient not onelie to iuſtifie the practiſe of the preſent Roman Church in this particular, but alſo to ſatisfie the aduerſe parte, if their im-

importunitie were not ſo exobbitant, that they will rather ſuffer pore Chriſtians to paſſe out of the world without that diuine *viaticum* ordained by God for the confort of their ſoules, & defenſe againſt their enimies in that dãgerous trance, then ſuffer them to receiue it without a competent number as they tearme it: which impious order of theirs may be ſeene in their booke of common prayer title *of the communion of the ſicke*: not obſtanding our Sauiours moſt ſtrict, and generall charge affirming that vnleſſe we eate his flesh, and drinke his bloud, we cannot haue life in vs. But certaine it is that in this as is in other matters the pretenſiue reformers may ritelie be compared to the Phariſees, *exolantes culicem, camelum autem glucientes* I who ſtraine a gnat, and ſwallowe a camel, in that they ſtande ſo peremptorilie vpon the communion of the people with the Preiſt in all occaſions which is but a circumſtance of the precept: and yet make no ſcruple of violating the precept itſelfe euen in time of it greateſt neceſſitie and obligation. But this I ſpeake onelie vpon ſuppoſition their communion were ſounde and according to Chriſts inſtition, for taking it as it is, the want of it is no loſſe to the not receiuers of it: and ſo I leaue them to the generall liberty they vſurpe as well in this as in other matters of Religion, and auncient practiſe of the Church.

Fur-

Definiuit. Sanctum Conciliū vt nullus presbyter præsumat ſolus miſſam cantare. Caſſander. p. 83.

Furthermore the knight citeth the coūcell of Nāts, to proue his tenet, but moſt ridiculouſly. For that there is not a worde touching the cōmuniō in all that text which he citeth. And the trueth is the councell onely reprehendeth the ſaying of Maſſe with out a clarke, or Miniſter as it ſeemes ſome cloiſters of monkes did accuſtome to doe in thoſe times, ſo you ſee this is quite out of the purpoſe, as is alſo another citation out of Innocent the third libr. 2. c. 24. he onely ſaying that it is piouſly to be beleeued that the Angells of God doe aſſiſt at Maſſe accompaning thoſe that praie. Not ſpeaking a worde good or bad of the communion of the people in that place.

Illos igitur (Angelos) quos habemus in oratione participes habemus in glorificatione conſortes. Innoc. lib. 2. 24. fine.

Laſtlie Sir Humfrey alledgeth the teſtimonies of diuerſe Romaniſts which hee calleth the confeſſion of his aduerſaries, that priuate Maſſe was altogether vnknowne to the primatiue Church. But I anſwer that when the knight cited thoſe authours he ought to haue remembred what hee was to proue according to the Irish article which he vndertaketh to defend and according to his owne poſition viz. That priuate Maſſe is contrarie to Chriſts inſtitution, and vnlawfull, and to be abrogated. This then he ought to haue proued if he ment to proue anie thing againſt the Roman doctrine. But in ſteede of this which he will neuer be able to proue, he proueth at the

moſt

moſt by the foreſaid teſtimonies, onelie that which the Romaniſts, doe not denie, to wit that the primatiue Church did practice the adminiſtration of the Euchariſt to thoſe that were preſent, but he proueth not that either that Church did ſoe in all occaſions, nor that she held it neceſſarie by virtue of anie lawe, or inſtitution of Chriſt, and ſo he laboureth in vaine as well in this as he hath done in other proofes often times before. Neither is this preſent point of Controuerſie betwene vs and the reformers about the auncient cuſtome of the primatiue Church concerning the communion of the people preſent at the Liturgie, but whether it is contrarie to Chriſts inſtitution or commaunde to celebrate priuate maſſes? the affirmatiue of which queſtion excepting Caſſander (whome I haue alreadie aduertiſed the reader to be no Romaniſt) nay nor yet Caſſander himſelfe nor anie one of the cited teſtimonies doth proue. Nay there is not one worde in anie of the places cited touching anie ſuch doctrine or precept of the Primatiue Church but onelie mention is made of the fact of auncient Chriſtians in that particular, with an addition of their owne verdit as houlding it for more profitable to the receiuers to communicate at euerie Maſſe, if their deuotion were ſo much extended as in thoſe more feruorous times of the primatiue ſpirit it appeeres to haue

bene.

bene. And although not onelie all or moſt of the authours rehearſed, but alſo the Councell of Trent itſelfe doth hould the foreſaid practice of the auncient Church to be more fruitefull for the Laytie then the cuſtome of more moderne ages: yet doth Sir Humfrey moſt abſurdelie hence inferre either the noueltie of the Roman doctrine, or the antiquitie of his owne. For that as we haue showed alreadie neither in anie of the cited authours nor in the Councell of Trent it ſelfe, as their wordes doe witneſſe, is there anie mention of doctrine or precept of the Primatiue Church but onelie of her fact and practice, from whence alſo may moſt eaſilie appeere the greate impertinencie of a further illation which the knight doth make concluding the greater fruitfulnes of his owne communion then of ours, whereas indeede his being no true communion at all, as not containing that which according to the inſtitution of Chriſt ought truelie and reallie to be in it, and ſo communicated truelie and reallie to the people, and not by figure and faith onelie, I meane the bodie and bloud of Chriſt, certaine it is that no ſuch inference can be made out of anie compariſon made betwene the Catholike communion and his owne, in regard there is no true paritie or ſimilitude to be founde in them: and moreouer it is ſo farre from being confeſſed by the cited authours that the communion of

the reformers is more fruitfull then their owne; that they teach expreſſelie that according to the doctrine of the reformed Churches touching the reall preſence, the receiuers of their Sacrament can receiue no fruite at all. And now let this ſuffice for anſer to thoſe authours *In generall*: Yet becauſe it may be my aduerſarie will not be ſatisfied with this generall anſer alone, as alſo becauſe I finde he hath vſed not a little of his vſuall proceeding in want of fidelitie in the citation of the authours, I ame content to deſcend to particulars, and examen them in order. The firſt the knight cites, is Cochlæus out of Caſſander, but neither he nor Caſſander haue anie thing in that place againſt priuate Maſſe, but onelie teſtifie what the cuſtome of the auncient Church was, which, as I haue alreadie declared, is impertinent to this purpoſe. Beſides Sir Humfrey tranſlates Cochleus wordes corruptedlie, for he doth not ſay that the holie Goſte hath thought vs a remedie againſt the ſlouthfulnes of the Preiſts in celebrating of priuate Maſſe, but he ſaith, *the holie Ghoſt hath inuented and introduced a pious ſupplie of this negligence by the frequentation of ſuch Maſſes as Preiſts celebrate alone.* So by inuerting the wordes, the malitious knight impoſeth vpon the Preiſts onely for a faulte that which Cochleus calles a remedie prouided by the holie Goſt to ſupplie the faulte of the leſſe de-

uoute

noute ſorte of people as well as the defect of the Preiſts. Which defect neuertheleſſe Chocleus placeth not in their ſlouthfulneſſe in celebrating priuate Maſſes: but in not exhorting the laytie to communicate at euerie Maſſe, as his wordes ſufficiently declare.

In the ſecond place he cites Durand mymatenſis who as ſpeaking onelie of the cuſtome of the auncient Church and conſequentlie not againſt the Romaniſts, yet he corruptes him both in that for *Domino dicente*, he tranſlates; *according to Chriſts commaunde:* as alſo by leauing out his inſuing wordes which declare the reaſon of the alteration of that auncient cuſtome. *Sed excreſcente fidelium multitudine traditur inſtitutum vt tantum Dominicis diebus communicarent. But the multitude of beleeuers increaſing, it is deliuered vnto vs to haue beene inſtituded that they ſhould communicate onelie on ſundayes.*

Durand. rat. lib. 4. c. 53.

Odo vpon the Canon doth not diſproue priuate Maſſe, but onelie relates the different cuſtomes of the Church in different times. *Cum primitus miſſæ ſine collecta non fierent, poſtea mos inoleuit Eccleſiæ ſolitarias, & maxime in Cœnobijs, fieri miſſas.* d. 2. in Can. circa init. The ſame I ſay of Belethus, yet Sir Humfrey omits the reſt of his wordes. As he did in the teſtimonie of durand.

Hugo in ſpec.

In the teſtimonie of Card. Hugo who witneſſeth

neſſeth onelie the ſame in ſubſtance, he addes the worde *together*, which is not in the text, to mend his ill market, alſo letting ſlip ſome of his wordes which denote the cauſe of the change of the auncient vſe, which are theſe. *Sed propter peccatum circumſtans nos, ſtatutum eſt vt communicaremus ter in anno ſolum. But by reaſon of ſinne compaſsing vs about* (ſaith Hugo) *it was determined that we ſhould communicate onelie thriſe a yeare.* And in the next allegation of Toloſanus who ſayth no other then the reſt, he tranſlates myſterie for Maſſe.

Initio naſcentis Eccleſiæ Chriſtiani qui celebrationi Miſſę aderant, poſt acceptam pacem cõmunicare ſolebant. Durantus de rit. cap. 58.

In the citation of Mycrologus the craftilie omits: *iuxta antiquos Canones:* And for *ante oblationem* he tranſlates before cõmunion, becauſe he will not haue his reader to heare that either the communion of the people in euerie Maſſe might ſeeme to be an Eccleſiaſticall cuſtome or lawe onelie, or that there is anie ſuch matter as oblation in the celebration of diuine ſeruice, for that they themſelues haue it not in their newe Raphſodie.

For Caſſanders authoritie we do not care. And yet I can not finde in Mycrologus thoſe wordes which Caſſander and Sir Humfrey alledge out of him, to wit, *it can not properlie be called a communion except ſome beſides the Preiſt doe communicate*. Howbe it the ſame Caſſander in the ſame place doth not condemne priuate Maſſes for a Sacrilegious action, or to be pro-

prohibited, as Sir Humfrey and the reſt of the Nouelliſts commonlie maintaine: But onelie playing the parte of a Pacifyer, which he profeſſeth, perſuades that the auncient cuſtome may be reſtored. Nay and he addes further and that truelie, that the Preiſts ſay when they celebrate priuatelie, they doe not participate of the Sacrament in their owne priuate name, but in the name of the Church and people: which doubtleſſe in reaſon is ſufficient to make it a true communion, if otherwiſe it were not. And as for Mycrologus, certaine it is thar he is no condemner of priuate Maſſe, how ſoeuer he might eſteeme that communion leſſe proper, according to the Etymon of the worde, in which more then one doe not actuallie receiue, which is all he intendes, if anie ſuch ſaying he hath, which notwithſtanding is not contrarie to the doctrine or practiſe of the Romaniſts. *Innocentius tertius* onelie explicates the ancient cuſtome of the Church touching the communion of the people at euetie Maſſe, and the change of it at ſeuarall times and by degrees. And ſurelie if we conſider that the Noueliſts hould this Pope for one of their greateſt oppoſites in doctrine, it were madneſſes to imagin that he should in anie ſorte fauoure their tenets. And becauſe I reflected that Innocentius as being a Pope had no reaſon to finde anie greater fauour at Sir Humfreys hands then o-

Vid. Caſſander. pag. 998.

ther

ther Romanists haue founde, vpon vewe of the place I discouered that he had falselie translated some parte of Innocentius wordes, which make against him to wit, for these wordes: *quia nec hoc digne potuit obseruari*, he translates: by reason this custome was neglected, whereas he should haue put in English: *Because neither this could be dignely, or with due reuerence obserued*: By which false translation he inuertes the true cause of the altetation of the foresaid custome.

Hoffmeisterus onelie declares the publicitie of the auncient custome with a desire that endeauours may be vsed for the restitution of it, with whome we Romanists all ioyne to our power; so this is out of the compasse of our question. The allegation of Doctour Harding who speakes much to the same purpose, I haue ansered in an other place and showed the deceite of the relatour, altho' in this place I finde he rehearses his wordes truelie, by reason it had auailed him nothing to haue here abused him.

Iustinian makes no mention of either priuate or publike Masses but onelie of the participation of one consecrated bread or loafe to signifie more expresselie the vnion of charitie, which is not to this purpose: as neither is the place of Bellarmin following lib. 2. de missa cap. 9. as afterwardes I will declare.

But to returne to Doctour Harding, it is true I find Sir Humfrey cytes him towardes the end of the ſame paragraffe out of Iewell, which altho' he makes nothing for the proofe of his intent in this place, but is onelie brought in vpon the by to enlarge and fournish his diſcourſe, as I ſuppoſe, yet doth he abuſe that learned diuine in that he leaueth out one ſpeciall reaſon which he alledges why the primatiue Catholikes vſed to communicate euerie day with the Preiſt, becauſe, ſayth he, they looking hourelie to be catched & put to death by the Panimes (I relate the ſenſe not the formall wordes) ſhould not departe without the *viaticum*. Which wordes being the verie harte of the authours ſentence, Sir Humfrey verie ſlylie omits it, as if it were not to the purpoſe, and by that meanes he moſt deformedlie couples the head and the heeles together, which corruption altho' it doth not much auaile him, yet it ſeemes he makes a recreation of that arte, and ſo he will rather playe ſmale game then ſit out.

Laſtelie the wordes of Iuſtinian taken out of his Commentarie vpon 1. Cor 10. are impertinent, for he does not affirme that the Communion directlie was giuen to all that were preſent, as his wordes cited by the knight doe teſtifie, which authour being the laſte which he cites, and no more to his purpoſe

then

then the reſt, let this ſuffice for the cenſure of the contents of this whole paragraffe, and particularlie for the confutation of that aſperſion of Noueltie, and corruption with the knight doth indeuore calumniouſlie to caſt vpon the Roman Creede, it nowe being plainelie cleered and iuſtified by that which hath beene ſaid, and he himſelfe conuinced of falſe dealing and forgerie.

The paragraffe inſueing is of the ſeuen Sacraméts. And to be plaine with Sir Humfrey, I ſay that in the verie entrance of his treatie he telleth a plaine lie to his reader, affirming the Romaniſts to relie wholie vpon the Councell of Trent in this pointe. For this Councell expreſſelie hath in the margent of the decree of the ſeptenarie number of Sacraments, the Councell of Florence, and in the decrees of euerie ſeuerall Sacrament there is reference to ſcriptures, Councels and Fathers, as the margines doe teſtifie. Wherefore thus the knight beginneth, and how he will proceed I know not, but yet for the moſt parte an ill beginning makes an ill ending.

Firſt he reprehendeth Bellarmin for ſaying that the authoritie of the Councell of Trent if there were no other ought to ſuffice for proofe of the ſeptinarie number of the Sacraments. But he might with farre greater reaſon haue reprehend both his owne temeritie and

the presumption of the reformed Churches. Which without anie such authoritie as the Councell of Trent hath, doe denie the foresaid number of Sacraments. Besides that Bellarmins meaning is not that the Coūcell of Trent hath sufficient authoritie to define the same without foundation of the worde of God, or without scripture as it seemes Sir Humfrey falselie supposeth, but that supposing such a foundation, it hath infallible power to declare the same as conformeable to trueth & to the auncient doctrine and practise of the Church in former ages, and consequentlie as a matter of faith. And certainelie that Church which hath not this authoritie is no true Church nor such an one as is described in the scriptures, but a meere conuenticle or Scismaticall cōgregation vnsuteable to the worde of God. And whereas it seemes straunge to Sir Humfrey that according to Bellarmine, one testimonie of a late Councell might suffice for the establishing of an article of faith for that by his owne *tenet* such an article requires both antiquitie, vniuersalitie and consent: let him but truelie and sincerelie consider what Bellarmines meaning is, and he will presentlie cease to maruell at his position. He must therefore know that whereas Bellarmin affirmeth that the Councell of Trent alone might bee sufficient to declare vnto the whole Church as an infallible trueth

that

that the number of Sacraments properlie and truelie so called is no more nor lesse then seauen, his meaning is that because the foresaid Councell is of as greate authoritie as other generall Councells euer haue had in times past, it ought to haue the same credit in the present Church touching those points which it hath defined, that they had in the Church of their times in such matters as they then defined, and consequentlie that as those points of doctrine which notwithstāding they had beene doubtfull before, were neuertheless by the same Conncels determined as certaine and infallible doctrine of faith without anie defect of antiquitie vniuersalitie, or consent, & in such manner as all the whole Christian world was boūd vnder paine of damnation to beleeue it, as is manifest in the consubstantiallitie of the second person definde in the Councell of Nice, the diuinitie of the third person in the first Councell of Constantinople, the vnitie of the person of Christ in the Ephesin, and the duplicitie or distinction of his natures in the Councell of Calcedon, as also the duplicitie or distinction of his wills in the sixt Councell celebrated at Constantinople: so in like manner ought the present Church to doe with the Councell of Trent in all it definitions, and particularlie in the definition of the number of the seuen Sacraments, which definition ought to

be held for certaine as well as the former determinations of the foresaid Councels, both in respect it was decreed by the authoritie of the same succeeding Church by which those definitions were made, as also in regard it hath antiquitie, vniuersalitie, and consent, both in asmuch as it is deduced from the scriptures by infallible authoritie, and also for that we doe not finde anie either of the auncient Fathers, or moderne diuines to haue denied the Sacraments to be seuen in number, or affirmed them to be onelie two as the reformers commonlie teach.

Now for the second reprehension which Sir Humfrey maketh of Bellarmin for saying, that if we take away the credit of the present Church and present Councell of Trent, the decrees of all other Councels, nay euen Christian faith it selfe might be called in question: this reprehension I say is as friuolous as the former, for that according to both Bellarmines supposition and the trueth it selfe, the present Roman Church and Councell of Trent, being of the same authoritie, as I haue aboue declared, with the Church and Councels of more auncient times, and also it being euident that as in those daies diuerse points of doctrine haue bene called in question by the heretikes of those times, so they might at this present be brought againe in doubt by others, as experience

cience itſelfe hath taught vs both euen in thoſe ſame matters which in former times haue bene definde, as appeereth by the hereſie of the new Trinitarians, and others: as alſo in other truethes which as yet were euer held in the Church for certaine, all this I ſay being moſt apparantlie true and out of all manner of doubt among the learned ſorte of people; doubtleſſe if, as Bellarmine ſaith, we take awaie the credit of the preſent Church and preſent Councell of Trent, or others which heereafter may be aſſembled, there will be no power leſte whereby to ſuppreſſe ſuch new oppinions, and errours, as by heretikes in diuers times and occaſions may be broached contrarie to the Chriſtian faith as well concerning matters alreadie determined in former Councells, as alſo touching ſuch new doctrine as may hereafter be inuented by other ſectaries, of which we haue too much experience in the Nouelliſts of theſe our dayes who call in queſtiõ diuers points defined in former Synods, of which we haue inſtances in the doctrine of the diſtinction of the diuine perſons queſtioned by the new Trinitarians, of the doctrine aboute the lawfull vſe and honour of images defined in the 7. Generall Councell the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation in the Councell of Lateran. The number of the Sacraments and the like reiected euen by Sir Humfrey him ſelfe and his fellowes: and conſequentlie that

which Bellarmine affirmeth in this ſenſe is moſt plaine and certaine and ſo farre from Atheiſme, as the contrarie is from trueth it ſelfe. And if Bellarmine be reprehenſible for equalizing the preſent Church and Councells with thoſe of auncient times, ſuerlie the reformers themſelues are farre more faultie and guiltie in this kinde, for that they doe not equalize but alſo preferre the authoritie of their owne preſent Congregations and Parleaments before the Church and Councells of farre more auncient times then is the date of their doctrine and religion. And this they doe not onelie in theſe points of doctrine which the later Councells haue determined againſt the later errours of Sectaries, as the knight doth odiouſlie ſugieſt, but alſo in ſome articles of moſt auncient faith and doctrine, as is manifeſtlie apparant in the pointe of the reall preſente, iuſtification, and the like.

And as for the reaſon which Sir Humfrey yeeldeth againſt the authoritie of the preſent Church, alledging that the worde of Chriſt is alone ſufficient for the faith of all beleeuing Chriſtians; this reaſon I ſay is of no force, it is but an ould ſong of the Puritans which hath beene a thouſand times repeated by the reformers, and as often refuted by the Romaniſts. And who denyes but that the worde of God certainelie knowe for ſuch, & truely interpre-

ted,

ted, and declared, is sufficient for the faith of all Christians: but to this who doth not also knowe that the authoritie of the Church is necessarie in all times and places? nay whoe doth not see that the one of necessaritie and as it were intrinsically inuolueth the other, and that in such sorte that the sectaries by excluding the infalible authouritie of the present Church from the sufficientie of the scripitures doe nothing lesse then deny that parte of the scripture which commendeth vnto vs the constant and perpetually successiue authority of the Church till the consommation of the worlde. And if Sir Humfrey had considered the reason which Bellarmin yeldes, surely he could not so much haue marauiled that he giues so great authority to the councell of Trēt, and present Church, for saith hee, if we take that away we haue no infallible testimonie that the former Councells were euer extant & that they were legitimate and that they defined this or that point of doctrine &c. for the mention which historians make of those councells is but a humane testimonie subiect to falsitie, thus Bell. all which discourse of his because he might haue more colour to complaine of him, and the the Romā Church, the insyncere knight resolued to keep it from the eyes of his reader. True it is that the reformers out of their greate purenesse or rather out of their pure madnesse, doe

vsuall

vsually exclaime againſt the ſuppoſed ſuperſtitions of the Roman Church, but the Romaniſts may farre more iuſtly complaine of them in the ſame kinde, in regarde that, ſuperſtition is noething els addording to the etimologie of the worde, but ſuperfluous religion, and to tie the worde of God to the preciſe written caracter alone, in my conceipt, is the higheſt degree of ſuperſtition that can be imagined, becauſe theſe preciſians by that meanes doe ſo exceſſiuelie, and ſuperfluouſly extoll the written worde, that by their excluſiue hiperbole of the ſufficiencie of it alone, they renounce all other ſortes of worde of God, either preached or otherwiſe deliuered to the Church, either in plaine tearmes or at the leaſt by neceſſarie ſequelle, which is noething els but out of a ſuperfluous preciſenes, to aſſigne limits to that which is illimitable, and boundes to that which is infinite, and conſequently out of a ſuperſtitious zeale of religion to deſtroy all true religion, and the true worde of God it ſelfe.

Furthermore for the ſufficiencie of the written worde preciſelie, the knight citeth the Apoſtle S. Paule act. 20. verſ. 27. were he ſaith ſo: *I haue not shunned to declare vnto you all the counsell of God*, but this is ſo impertinentlie alledged that it needes no anſwer: it being manifeſt that the Apoſtle neither ſpeaketh of ſcripture alone, nor intendeth to exclude other

partes

partes of the worde of God, nor yet ſo to limit that which he himſelfe writ or ſpoake as if he had deliuered in writing all the doctrine without exception which is any waie neceſſarie to the ſaluation of euerie mans ſoule both in generall and in particular. Otherwiſe it would follow that all which the reſt of the ſacred writers haue published in the ſcriptures were ſuperfluous and no way neceſſarie to haue beene penned. Beſides that S. Paule in the place cited, ſaith not that he hath written, but onely that he hath *declared vnto them all the councell of God*, and ſo he neither in wordes nor sēſe fauoureth the reformers tenet of the all ſufficiencie of the writtē worde but rather Sir Hūfrey is here to be noted for a corruptor of the text. And no leſſe idlely doth the knight cite for the ſame purpoſe the teſtimonie of Bellarm. his meaning being ſo farre from this matter as that if hee were not his aduerſarie as he is moſt plainelie euen in this point, yet had it beene meere madneſſe to haue as much as named him in this particular, and ſo perhaps for this reaſon onely he was aſhamed to quote the place, yet as comonly he doth in other occaſions.

Finally for concluſion of his diſproofe of the authoritie of the preſent Roman Church, Sir Humfrey demaundeth of vs how the faith of Chriſtians can depend vpon a Church which is fallen from the faith, or generall beliefe of Chri-

Christianitie can rely safely vpon a coūcell that is disclaimed by the greatest parte of the world. By England by France by Germany? But to this I answere that in this double question, he telleth his reader at the least a double lye, both which we must take vpon his owne credit, for he alledgeth nothing but his owne worthie word, which of how little worth it is we haue sufficientlie tryed allreadie. Wherefore we must with his leaue tell him that neither it is true that the Roman Church is fallen from the faith, except he meanes from the faith of Luther and Caluin, or from his owne English faith, from which neuertheleſſe the Roman Church cannot truelie be affirmed to haue fallen, but it from her, she hauing beene in the world manie hundrethes of yeares before the authours of the new Religion were created; nor is it true that the Tridentine Councell is disclaimed by the greater parte of France and Germanie at this present time in matters of faith. To saie nothing of Italie, Spaine, Poland, Hungarie; and those most vast and spatious Indian Regions of later yeeres reduced to the Roman faith, all with nations doe conteine a farre greater number of such as imbrace the foresaid Councell then there are reformers in the world who reiect the same. Especiallie considering that euen amongst the reformed Churches themselues notwithstanding the

moſt rigorous lawes & proceedings which they vſe againſt the Roman Catholikes where they haue the ſuperioritie of power, yet is there no ſmale number to be founde of thoſe who willinglie receiue all the doctrine of faith, conteyned in the Tridentine Sinod: and conſequentlie it appeeres by this that Sir Humfrey hath failed mightilie in his Coſmographie and calculation, when he affirmeth that the foreſaid Councell is diſclaimed by the greateſt parte of the world; except in his greateſt parte he includes Iewes, Turkes and Gentiles, or at the leaſt count for his owne, all thoſe which are not Romaniſts of what ſect or faction ſoeuer they be, as ſome of his reformed brothers vſe to doe not excluding the moſt vnchriſtian heretikes the Arians out of the number of the members of their Congregation, to make it showe more ample and glorious.

After this the knight out of the vehemencie of his zealous Spirit, falls into a fearefull execration taking vpon him *the Anathema if anie man aliue ſhall proue that the ſeuen Trent Sacraments were inſtituted by Chriſt, or that all the Fathers, or anie one Father in the Primatiue Church, or anie knowne authour for aboute a thouſand yeeres after Chriſt, did teach that there were neither more nor leſſe then ſeuen Sacraments truelie and properlie ſo called, and to be beleeued of all for an article of faith*. Thus hee. with ſo manie turnings

hings and windinges as you ſee, and ſo manie limitations of his ſpeech, that a man would thinke it vnpoſſible but that he might eſcape the ſnare of his owne conditional curſſe, which yet he doth not, but rather falleth flatte into it, as I will preſentlie shewe.

And firſt I ſay that if Sir Humfrey would content himſelfe with the authoritie or teſtimonie of dead men, I could remitte him not to one but to one hundreth authours who yet aliue in their workes doe teſtifie the foreſaid inſtitution in plaine tearmes, to witt all thoſe diuines who liued and writ euer ſince the time of Petrus Lombardus, of whom as from their common maſter they receaued the doctrine of the ſeuen Sacraments as ſucceſſiuelie deduced from the inſtitution of God, and deliuered it to their ſucceſſours with greate vniformitie and conſent, as appeereth by their bookes. And altho' this might be ſufficient to ſatisfie anie reaſonable perſon in the world, neuertheleſſe becauſe Sir Humfreys importunitie is ſo greate that he will needes haue the teſtimonies of liue authours, I remitte him to all thoſe who either in the publike vniuerſities or pulpits of all Catholike countries doe teach and preach the ſame at this daie to witt that not onelie a thouſand yeeres after Chriſt, but euen from the time of Chriſt himſelfe or at the leaſt from the time of his Apoſtles preaching and writing,

there

there were neither more nor lesse, then seuen Sacraments truelie and properlie so called and to be beleeued of all for an article of faith as instituted by Christ. The number of which authours being not onelie verie greate in itselfe, but also farre greater and of farre more learned men then all those who in the reformed Churches hould the contrarie as I persuade my selfe Sir Humfrey cannot denie: it is most euidēt that (to saie nothing of those auncient writers which by their proofes of euerie particular Sacrament by Scriptures and Fathes doe plainelie wittnesse the same trueth) he had no reason at all for this parte of his greate demaunded.

And now touching the rest of it, I answer first that as it is certaiue the reformers themselues if we should demaunde the like of them concerning the number of those Sacramēts which they defēd for truely & properly such, & to be belieued as an article of faith and as instituted by Christ, cannot prooue either by scripture or any one authour, I doe not say for about a Thousand yeeres as they doe, but for a Thousand and foure hundreth yeeres after Christ, that they are precisely twoe and no more nor lesse: so consequentie they ought not to require of vs that which they themselues are not able to performe in their owne cause and case.

Neuertheleſſe that our aduerſarie may plainely ſee we are not behinde with him, but rather farre before him and the reſt of his brothers in this particular, I anſwer farther that all thoſe Fathers who by expreſſe places of ſcripture proue euerie one of thoſe Sacraments in particular, and no other, which the Roman Church houldeth for truely & properlie ſuch, doe thereby alſo shew at the leaſt tacitly, that thoſe and no more nor leſſe are beleeued for ſuch by faith. For teſtimonie of which trueth becauſe it would be too tedious in anſwere of one argument to produce ſo many of the Fathers as might be alledged, I will onely alledge. S. Auguſtine, who beinge euen according to our aduerſaries oppinion of him, a faithfull witneſſe of antiquitie, his teſtimonie may iuſtly ſerue for all the reſt: and becauſe of the Sacramẽts of Baptiſme and Euchariſt there is no controuerſie, I will onely produce thoſe teſtimonies which conuince the other fiue.

Cal. Inſtit.

Wherefore that confirmation is truely and properlie a Sacrament S. Auguſtine affirmeth *lib. 2. contra lit. Pet. cap.* 104. where he ſaith thus. *The Sacrament of Chriſme in the nature of viſible ſignes*, Sacroſanctum eſt, is a *ſacred and holy Sacrament as Baptiſme*; and he hath the like of order *lib. 2. cont. Epiſt. Parm. cap.* 13. ſayinh. *They are both Sacraments, and both by a certaine conſecration are giuen to man,*

that

that when he is baptized, this when he is ordered and in the ſame place he alſo ſaith, *that both of them be Sacraments which no man doubteth.* Of Pennance he ſaith *lib. 1. de adult. coniug. cap. 26. & 28. eadem eſt cauſa Baptiſmi & reconciliationis, ſine quibus Sacramentis homines credunt ſe mori non debere. The ſame cauſe or reaſon is of Baptiſme and Reconciliation with out which Sacraments men beleeue they ought not to dye.* Matrimonie he compareth with Baptiſme *lib. 1. de nuptijs & concup. cap.* 10. where he ſaith that the matter of this Sacrament is, that man and woman ioyned in mariage may inſeperably perſeuer together as long as they liue. And the like ſaying he hath of the perpetuall effect of this Sacrament comparing it with the perpetuall effect of Baptiſme. And in the 14. *chapter* of his booke *de bono coniugali*, he compareth matrimonie with the Sacrament of Order, which order as we haue cited before, he compared with Baptiſme in another place. Finally of Extreame vnction he maketh mention *lib. 2. de viſit. infir. cap.* 4. and *in his* 215. Sermon of the ſaints. Where although he doth not in expreſſe tearmes affirme extreame vnction to to be one of the Sacraments, yet he expreſſely affirmeth there, *and ſerm. de temp.* 115. that the ceremonie of vnction which S. Iames mentioneth, and the promiſſe, belong vnto the faithfull, and are to be practized by the Prieſts

as the Apoſtle commaundes: all which proues plainly that S. Auguſtin held it for a Sacrament as well as the other ſix, and altho' ſome doubt may be made whether the booke *de viſit. infir.* be truelie S. Auguſtines worke, yet certaine it is that the authour of it is both good and auncient. And thus much out of S. Auguſtine for the proofe of euerie one of the ſeuen Sacraments in particular, beſides that which he ſpeaketh in generall of them, and of the benefit which the Church hath receaued from God by the inſtitution of them, in his firſt ſermon vpon the 108. pſalme, where he ſaith thus. *What a greate gift is the office of the adminiſtration of the Sacraments in Baptiſme, Euchariſt, and in the reſt of the holy Sacraments?* ſo that we ſee that S. Auguſtin ſtanneth plainely againſt the doctrine of Sir Humfrey. And doth fully anſwer his queſtion touching the number of the Sacraments defended by the Roman Church. And ſuppoſing he makes ſoe ſpeciall mention of theſe ſeuen as he doth more then of any other externall ſigne or ceremonie of the Church (to ſome of which neuertheles he giueth alſo the name of Sacrament) and ſuppoſing alſo he cõpareth or all moſt of them with thoſe two which the reformers themſelues hould for proper and true Sacraments, in their effects and ſanctitie, as alſo amplifying the benefit which God hath conferred to the

Church

Church by the inſtitution of them (that which he doth not with the reſt of the holie ſignes and ceremonies which the ſame Church alſo vſeth) ſuppoſing all theſe circumſtances I ſaie, it is more then certaine that he ſpeaketh of them as of true and proper Sacramants which for ſuch haue beene recreaued and belieued in the vniuerſall Church euen euer ſince the time of Chriſt the inſtitutour of them. And ſo let this ſuffice for an anſwere of that vaſt demande of our Thraſoniã knight, and to demõſtrate, that notwithſtanding all his circumſpection, his owne conditionall curſe is turned into an abſolute, and ſo is fallen vpon him with all it weight and forces as a iuſt punishment of the temeritie and exceſſe of that boldnes, which he committeth in proteſting, againſt a truth confirmed with ſuch authoritie and teſtimonie as may ſatisfie the moſt tender conſcience and ſettle the moſt wauering minde in the world. And yet for confirmation of the foreſaid anſwere, we may further adde, that ſuppoſing the Maſter of Sentences ſo manie yeeres paſt defended the ſeauen Sacraments with the inſtitution of them by Chriſt himſelfe and their neceſſitie and profit in the Church of God: and ſuppoſing the ſame authour writ nothing but what he found in the auncient Fathers, from the collection of whoſe ſentences he tooke his appellation: ſuppoſing I ſay

Sacramẽta verò rituſque in hac ipſa Catholica recte ſententium Chriſtianorum Eccleſia, ſunt ſeptem. Baptiſma, Chryſma ſancti vnguenti, diuina communio, manus impoſitio, matrimonium, Pœnitentia & ſacrum Oleum Et ſtatim. Quod vero hæc ſola ſint nec plura numero: etiã diuiſione clarum fit &c. Patriarcha Conſtantinop. Reſ. ad Doctores

all this which his workes doe witneſſe, it is moſt apparent in the morall iudgment of anie indifferent man, that the doctrine which he deliuered concerning the foreſaid number of Sacraments, was no other then the faith of the vniuerſall Church & alſo the verie ſame which by the generall conſent of ſchoole diuines in later ages hath binne taught & preached euen by thoſe of the Grecian Church, as by the teſtimonie of Hieremie the late Patriarch of Conſtantinople in his anſwer to the Auguſtan Confeſſion doth plainelie appeere; where the ſeptenarie number of Sacraments is expreſſelie maintained againſt the Lutherans as his wordes here quoted in the margent clearelie teſtifie with ſhame enuffe to the reformed brothers: for thus he ſaith. Truelie the Sacraments & rites in this ſame Catholike Church of right vnderſtanding Chriſtians are ſeuen: Baptiſme, chriſme of holie oyntment, the diuine communion, impoſition of handes, Matrimonie, Pennance, and ſacred oyle. &c.

But the knight goeing yet further in the proofe of his duall number, telleth his reader, that the two Sacraments which his Church defends are properlie Sacraments becauſe they haue element and inſtitution: but the other fine are not ſuch becauſe they want eyther of theſe. But to this I anſwere that the fiue Sacraments which the reformers reiect, haue not

onely

onelie this which Sir Humfrey requires to his two defaced Sacraments, but alſo beſides this, they haue promiſe of iuſtificant grace, which according to the deſcription he maketh heere, his two doe want; and ſo I retort his prrofe vpon him. For if our fiue be not properlie Sacraments becauſe in his conceipt they want inſtitution and element; ſurelie neither are his two properlie Sacraments becauſe they want grace, as being but ſignes or elements inſtituted by God not giuing grace both according to his former declaration, and alſo in the common doctrine of the reformers: And ſo we ſee that the knightes diſcourſe touching the propertie of his two miniſteriall elements is but a graceleſſe peice of doctrine, eſpeciallie conſidering that if he had binne but halfe ſo conuerſant in our diuines as he will needes ſeeme to be, he might moſt eaſilie haue found both inſtitution element, and grace, annexed to all thoſe fiue Sacraments which he renounceth: which Catholike diuines altho' they doe not all agree in the aſſignation of the ſeuerall matters and formers of the ſame, yet doe they neuertheleſſe with great conformitie conſent in the number & generall definition of them, to wit that they are all externall and ſenſible ſignes which by diuine inſtitution haue the promiſe of iuſtifying grace annexed. And leaſt the knight take exceptions and complaine that I doe not

Wittemb. fol. 11.

Caluin. Inſtit. lib. 4. cap. 14, & 15.

ſatisfiie his argument my ſelfe, but remit him to others for an anſwere; I will breiflie shewe out of ſcripture both the inſtitution and element of euerie one of the foreſaid fiue Sacraments in particular. Confirmation therefore was inſtituted by Chriſt in thoſe places of ſcripture where he promiſeth to his Apoſtles the Holie Ghoſt after his aſcenſion, as S. Iohn the 16. 5. Luke the 24. 48. which collation of the holie Ghoſt was exerciſed by the Apoſtles Act. 10. & 19. by impoſition of hands after they had receaued the ſame holie Ghoſt by that extraordinarie manner which is deſcribed Act. 2. which impoſitiõ togither with the words vſed Act. 8. whẽ they prayed for thẽ on whom they put their hands, are the matter and forme of this Sacrament. And now heere we ſee both the inſtitution and the element in this Sacrament, which is all Sir Humfrey requireth of vs; and ſo I will ſay vnto him that which S. Hierome ſaid to his aduerſaries the Luciferians the 4. chap. *Si quæris quare in Eccleſia baptizatus non niſi per manus Epiſcopi accipit Spiritum Sanctum, diſce hanc obſeruationem ex ea authoritate deſcendere quod poſt aſcenſionem Domini Spiritus ad Apoſtolos deſcendit*, That is to ſay, *If thow doeſt aske me, why he that is baptized doth not receaue the holie Ghoſt but by the hands of the Bishop, learne that this obſeruation deſcended from that authoritie that after the aſcenſion of our Lord*

the Spirit descended vpon the Apostles.

Secondlie the Sacrament of Penance hath both element and institution; the element is the acts of the penitent declared by sensible words or signes, the institution is the collation of power conferred by Christ to remitte sinnes, to his Apostles and in them to all true Preistes according to that of the 20. of Saint Iohn, *Receaue yee the holie Ghost, whose sinnes you shall forgiue they are forgiuen, and whose sinnes you shall retaine they are retayned.* In which words both the institution and the element be sufficientlie declared; especiallie if we ioyne the declaration of the Church, without which euen those two which the reformers hould for Sacramẽts cãnot be conuinced to be truly and properlie such, if one were obstinately disposed.

Thirdlie in the Sacrament of Extreme Vnction both the element and institution are plainelie enough found in the 5. chap. of S. Iames: where the Apostle sayth. *If anie man be sick among you, let him bring in the Prieſtes of the Church and let them pray ouer him annointing him with oyle in the name of our Lord, and the prayer of faith shall saue the sick, and our Lord shall lift him vp, and if he be in sinnes they shalbbe remitted him.* In which place to the externall signes of prayer and oyle, remission of sinnes is annexed, as the reader may plainelie perceiue; which effect euen according to the doctrine of the refor-

mers themselues as I suppose cannot be found but onelie in such ceremonies as properlie are instituted by Christ himselfe for Sacraments.

Fourthlie the like I say of Order, the substance of which is so plainelie conteyned in the scriptures, that some of the greatest reformers haue not had the face to exclude it out of the number of the Sacraments of the new lawe, and the places of Scripture which conuince the truth of it are 1. Timo. 4. and 2. Thimothie 1. where both the sensible element which is the imposition of hands, and the effect of grace annexed, are cleerlie described; which effect I thinke our aduersaries confesse, cannot be possiblie conferred but onelie by Gods authoritie and institution. The wordes of the Apostle are these in the first place. *Doe not neglect the grace which is in the: which was giuen the by prophesie with the imposition of the hands of preisthood.* In the second place the wordes are these. *For which cause I admonish the to resuscitate the grace of God which is in the by the imposition of my handes.*

Vid. Cal. l. 3. Inst. c. 4. §. 20. & c. 19. §. 31.

Now lastlie concerning Matrimonie, a mã might iustlie maruell that our new Euãgelistes should make anie question of it in this nature. For supposing their extraordinarie affection that way, and that single life is so vnsauourie to them that if it lay in their power, they would rather suffer the whole quire of

Virgins

virgins to perish, then they would make a religious vowe of perpetuall chastitie, or liue without a woman: supposing this I say in my opinion they ought in all reason sooner to haue honoured matrimonie with the title of a Sacrament, then to haue quite depriued it of that which the scripture it selfe doth giue it. Yet supposing they be so prepostorous, that they will rather impugne that which they otherwise loue best, then seeme to agree to the Romane doctrine, I tell them all and particularilie him with whome I dispute, that although mariage was by God himselfe onelie ordayned in paradise as a ciuill contract: Neuertheless Christe who came not to dissolue the lawe, but to eleuate it to a higher degree of perfection; amongst other things he pleased to honore the same with the true nature and properties of a Sacrament; giuing also tho' not immediatlie by himselfe, yet by his Apostle S. Paul, the verie name and title of a Sacrament; whereas notwithstanding neyther he himselfe nor anie of his Apostles or Euangelists euer gaue that name to anie of the rest of the Sacraments. Wherefore to come nearer to the purpose; I say that the institution of this Sacrament was by Christe himselfe, who in the 19. chapter of S. Mathewe ordayned the coniunction of man & wife to be inseperable to the end it so might be a sacred signe of the indissoluble coniunction

ction of Christe and his Church, as it is declared by the Apostle Ephes. 5. where he expreslie giueth it the name of a *great Sacrament* in regard of the sacred coniunction (partelie by the hypostaticall vnion, and partelie by the vnion of charitie) betwixt Christe and his spouse the Church which it signifieth. Which foresaid coniunction of man and wife explicated by words of the present tense is the element; and Christs ordinance and application of the same to the foresaid signification, is the institution, by virtue of which it also conferreth grace to the receiuers, to the end they may liue in that perpetuall vnion of mindes which is required to the representation of the inseperable vnion of Christe and his Church; which is all and more then our aduersarie himselfe demaunded of vs before in this particular matter. To which if we adde the authoritie of the Church and auncient fathers for the interptetation of those scriptures which we haue produced for proofe of the truth of this, and the rest of the foresaid fiue Sacraments (which authorities of the fathers if need required and the place did serue for them I could easilie produce) it would yet more plainelie appeere with how little reason the pretensiue reformed Congregations doe exclude them out of the number of true and proper Sacraments.

And so now according to this a verie easie

answere

anſwere may be framed to all that which the knight bringeth againſt the ſeptenarie number of Sacraments in the reſt of this paragraph, and particularilie to the teſtimonies of thoſe Romane authours and Fathers which he produceth in fauour of his cauſe. And firſt touching the Fathers which hee citeth beſides that which hath binne alreadie ſpoken I further adde, that there was not one of them which was of the reformers opinion in this matter as is moſt apparent in that Sir Humfrey himſelfe could not produce ſo much as one Father that auerreth the onelie duall number of Sacraments: Nay they are ſo farre ſtom this, that there is not one of them, who doth not in one place or other make expreſſe mention of more then two, if profeſſedlie they make mention of anie at all.

Secondlie I ſay, that as the reformers cannot with anie probabilitie inferre out of thoſe Fathers who affirmed that the two Sacraments Baptiſme and the Euchariſt haue flowed out of the ſide of Chriſte, that there are no more nor leſſe then two; ſo neyther can they in anie ſort thence inferre that the ſame Fathers taught not the ſeptenarie number of Sacraments. And more then this if the reformers ſtand vpon this ſo much that the Fathers by the bloud which iſſued out of our Sauiours ſide, vnderſtood the Sacrament of the bloud of

Chriſte

Christe, then they must consequentlie eyther confesse that the same Fathers held the reall presence of the bloude of Christe in the Eucharist, which yet they themselues denie, or else at the least that the reformed Churches haue no true Sacrament at all, for that according to their confession, there is in it neyther bloud nor bone. And out of this generall answere to the testimonies of the auncient Fathers, we may inferre how falselie Sir Hnmfrey in the end of his 149. page affirmeth, that they did insist sometimes in the number of two and so restrayned the Church to the definite number of two onelie, which saying of his is a manifest falsitie and iniurious to those Fathers whome he so chargeth, as that which I haue produced out of S. Augustine in this period doth plainelie conuince in these fiue Sacraments which the reformers denie: Neyther was he able to produce one testimonie out of anie of them for proofe of his fayned position; but so leaueth it vnconfirmed more then with that same vntruth by which he belyeth most impudentlie the foresaid Fathers all at a clappe.

Neyther hath that which he further addeth of the same Fathers in the next page anie greater truth or foundation then this, where he sayth that had the Fathers beleeued that those fiue Sacraments had binne instituted by Christe they would of necessitie haue concluded them

for

for true and proper Sacraments, and haue eaſilie found in them the number of ſeuen: Thus in effect Sir Humfrey diſcourſeth, to which I anſwere firſt that doubtles if the Fathers had had but halfe the occaſion which the Church hath had ſince their time, and eſpeciallie ſince the foundation of the reformed Churches; they would of neceſſitie haue treated and ſpoken expreſſelie of the ſeptenarie number, and haue diſtinguished as now the Church and diuines doe betwixt proper and improper Sacraments: But the occaſion fayling, they neyther had neceſſitie nor conueniencie to ſpeake otherwiſe of them then they haue donne: Nay ſome of them, eſpeciallie thoſe who writ againſt the Gentiles, were rather obliged by the courſe of thoſe times, not to mention the ſecret miſteries of our faith at all, then to reueale them to the profaners of them, more then was preciſelie neceſſarie for the anſwere of their obiections, which indeed is the true reaſon, why diuerſe of the foreſaid more auncient Fathers haue ſpoken ſo obſcurelie and ſparinglie euen of ſome of the cheife miſteries of Chriſtian Religion. Vid. Theodoret. Dial. 2.

Secondlie I ſay, that howſoeuer the auncient Fathers ſpoke of the expreſſe number of the Sacraments, certaine it is, they eyther expreſſlie taught, or at the leaſt ſuppoſed for certaine doctrine of faith that all thoſe which the Ro-

mane

mane Church now holdeth for true and proper Sacraments doe giue diuine grace to the receiuers, as it is apparent out of those places which I cited before out of Saint Augustine for the proofe of euerie seuerall Sacrament and their seuerall effects; and consequentlie they held implicitelie at the least, and if either necessitie or iuste occasion had required they would haue concluded expresselie the septenarie number of Sacraments, and that they were instituted by Christe for such truely and properly.

And now for the more moderne diuines who wrote since the time of P. Lumbard, of which Sir Humfrey citeth to the number of twelue or thirteene, there is not one of them who holdeth onely two proper Sacraments as the reformers doe: nay there is not one of them that doth not expresse defende the septenarie number of true and proper Sacraments, excepting perhaps Alexander Hales and Durand may seeme to opinate otherwise to the incircúspect reader, of which two authours neuertheless I say first that Hales doth not denie all those seauen, nor anie one of them in particular which the Romane Church defendes to be trulie and properlie Sacraments, but he onely is of opinion that onelie fower of them are to be called Sacraments of the new lawe, for that as he imagined the other three, to wit Pen-

nance,

nance, Order, and Matrimonie, had their beginning before. True it is, Hales cannot be excused from errour in that he affirmeth Confirmation to haue binne instituted by the Councell of Melda (except he meaneth onelie, that there it was declared to be properlie a Sacrament as I am persuaded he doth) but neuertheleſſe ſuppoſing this his ſingular opinion, yet notwithſtanding it being withall certayne, that he holdeth the ſame Sacrament to be one of the ſeauen no leſſe then he doth Penance which yet he held (as it ſeemeth to ſome later writers) to haue binne inſtituted by the Apoſtles, notwithſtanding all this I ſay, he is impertinentlie alleaged by the knight as an impugner of the Romane doctrine in the ſeptenarie number of Sacraments, which notwithſtanding his other allucinations, he as expreſſelie maintaines as other diuines doe as his owne wordes plainelie teſtifie ſaying thus in his 4. parte and eight queſtion. *According to the number of ſpirituall diſeaſes, the number of Sacraments is to be taken, there are ſeauen differences of diſeaſes.* What therefore can be more manifeſt that this authour tought the compleat number of ſeuen Sacraments?

Iuxta numerum malorum ſpiritualiũ debet ſumi numerus Sacramẽtorum, ſeptem ſunt differentiæ morborũ. Hal. 4. part. q. 8. mem. 7. act. 2.

And as for Durand, certaine it is that he doth not denie Matrimonie to be a Sacrament abſolutelie as the reformers doe, but he at the moſt onely affirmeth that it is not properly

and

and vniuocallie a Sacrament conferring grace in the ſame manner the other ſix doe; which opinion of his altho' as it ſounds it can not ſtand firme with the doctrine of the Church: yet this not our queſtion, and in caſe it were, yet is there no reaſon why one mans priuate tenet, nay nor the priuate tenet, or errour of more then one or two ſhould preiudicate the common doctrine of the Church both before and after him, nor diminish her antiquitie and vniuerſalitie in anie point of doctrine eſpecial-lie where there is no obſtinacie in the authour, as in theſe there was not: neyther can the aduerſaries drawe anie argument of force againſt the ſame in anie caſe, out of one onelie authour or more, if more there were, contrarie to the torrent of all the reſt. To omit that as vaſques noteth, the ſame Durand in the ſame place expreſlie affirmeth that it is an hereſie to denie that Matrimonie is a Sacrament, which doubtleſſe is a cõcluding argumẽt that when Durãd affirmed Matrimonie not to be vniuocallie or iuſte as the reſt be a Sacramẽt, he did not abſolutely deny it to be one of thoſe ſeuẽ which the church did both then hold, & now houldeth to be true Sacramẽts: but at the moſt he onely denied the truth & propertie of it in that ſtrict & vniuocall manner of conferring iuſtificãt grace, as he and other diuines affirme of the reſt: which being ſo, then cannot the Reformers

haue

haue anie colour to alledge this teſtimonie either againſt the abſolute truth of that Sacrament, or againſt the Septenarie number of it with the other. Nay more then this hauing now exactelie examined the matter I finde that Durand beſides that he expreſſelie defendes the total number of ſeuen Sacraments diſputing ſeuerallie of the nature of euerie one of them, he doth in particular affirme of Matrimonie euen in his reſolution or direct anſer to the queſtion, abſolutelie that it is a Sacrament; and puts it in the laſt place for one of the ſeuen. And theſe are his wordes in their ſeuerall places noted in the margent.

Tenendū eſt abſolute quod matrimonium eſt Sacramē-tum. Quia hoc determinauit Eccle. in 4.d.26. q. 3.

Et ita ſunt in vniuerſo ſeptē Sacramenta. Idem d.2. q.2.n.6.

To which if we adde that which Capreolus doth teſtifie of the ſame durand, all doubt of his true meaning in this point will quite vanish away. For Capreolus ſaith that *in his laſt worke or edition he was conſtrained to ſpeake more cautelouſly ſoe that he confeſſed matoimonie to be truely and properly a Sacrament, but not vniuocally.* By which, and that alſo which I haue ſaid before touching Alexander Hales the learned reader may perceiue that both the one and the other are againſt truth and reaſon alledged againſt the ſeptenarie number of Sacraments, and againſt the vniuerſalitie of the doctrine of the Roman Church in that point, ſuppoſing they differ not from the reſt of the Romaniſts as their owne wordes witneſſe,

Coactus fuit in vltimo opere cautius loqui, vt ſcilicet confiteretur matrimonium eſſe vere & proprie Sacramē-tum, ſed non vniuoce cum aliis nouæ legis Sacramentis &c. Ca-

preolus in 4. sent. d. 26. q. 1. §. Quantum ad tertium durandi.

Except it be in the manner of defending that same number, yet both agreeing in the substance of the Controuersie here proposed by the knight our aduersarie, and absolutelie affirming that there are truelie seuen Sacraments in the Catholike Church.

Moreouer in the citation of the other moderne diuines, Sir Humfrey vseth much fraud and cosenage: and remitting the rest till afterwardes which I will examen in their due places as they are quoted by the knight, I will first produce those two whose bookes I had at the first, and both of whome he egregiouslie abuseth. Bellarmin is corrupted by him in three seuerall places cited in this one paragraph. And first he is corrupted in his Second booke of the effect of Sacraments chap 24. where the Cardinall saying onelie that the aduersaries ought not to require of the Romanists that they shewe the name of the Septenarie number of the Sacraments either out of scripture or Fathers; yet honest Sir Humfrey translates out of the Latin quoted in his owne margent *the number of seuen* for the name of the number of seuen, repeating the same twise for fayling, and so daceiues his ignorant reader persuading him there by that euen by Bellarmins confession the number of the seuen Sacraments is not to be found either in scriptures or Fathers, whereas neuertheless *Bellarmin* saith no such thing

Primo notandū non debere aduersarios petere vt ostendamus in scripturis aut Patribus nomē septenarij Sacramētorum, nā nec ipsi possunt ostendere nomē Binarij vel ternarij &c. Bellar. l. 2. de effect. Sacr. c. 24.

thing, but onelie that the name of the foresaid number is not to be required in that manner supposing that the substance of a thing is oftentimes found both in scriptures and Fathers, and yet not the name it selfe, as appeares in the worde *Trinitie of persons*, and in the name of the number of two Sacraments, neither of which is extant in scriptures.

Secondlie Bellarmin is corrupted in his booke of Extreme Vnction cap. 2. Where the false knight makes his reader beleeue that Bellarmin was one of those who disagreed from the doctrine of other diuines in the doctrine of the fiue Sacraments, which he and his companions denie to be truelie and properlie Sacraments, and yet the Cardinall onelie affirmes with some other authours that that vnction which the Apostles vsed aboute the sick and restored them to health the 6. of S. Marke, was not the Sacrament of Extreme Vnction, but rather a figure or obumbration of it: Which as you see is a farre different matter from the deniall of Extreme Vnction as it is vsed in the Church, to be properlie a Sacrament or one of the fiue reiected by the pretensiue reformed Congregations. Thirdlie the knight corrupteth Bellarmin whome he cites in the nynth chapter of his first booke of the Sacraments, where he peruertes both the translation of the wordes and sense. The wordes

Non omnes cõueniunt an cum Apostoli vngebant oleo infirmos (Marci 6.) & curabant, illa fuerit vnctio sacramentalis an solũ fuerit figura quædam &c. Bellar. lib. de Sacr. Extrem. Vnct. c. 2.

in that he Englisheth theſe, *non eſt ita notum*, *it is not ſo certaine*, whereas he ought to haue tranſlated, it is not ſo knowne: The ſenſe he corrupteth in that he perſuades his reader that Bellarmin confeſſeth that the foreſaid fiue Sacraments haue not their inſtitution from christ immediatelie: whereas he ſpeakes not a worde of the inſtiturion, but affirmes onelie that the ſacred things which the Sacraments ſignifie are three; iuſtifying grace, the paſſiō of Chriſt and eternall life; all which, that Baptiſme and Eucharrſt doe ſignifie ſaith he, *res notiſſima eſt*, it is moſt notorious, *de alijs Sacramentis non eſt ita notum*, of the reſt of the Sacraments it is not ſo notorious or knowne. Yet further adding that it is certaine that euen theſe fiue Sacraments which the reformers reiect ſignifie all thoſe three things at the leaſt implicitlie: But to ſaie that the foreſaid fiue Sacraments haue not their inſtitution immediatelie from Chriſt, neuer entred in to Bellarmins thoughts. And ſo if the knight had dealt playnelie and ſincerelie in the citation of that place of the Cardinall, he could haue found nothing for his purpoſe, but rather the contrarie.

tamen certum eſt ſaltem implicite ea omnia ſignificare &c. Bellar. loco cit.

Furthermore Sir Humfrey alſo corrupteth vaſquez moſt shamefullie in the 3. parte d. 2. cap. 5. n. 3. de Sacram. Matr. Where he impudentlie belyeth him affirming that Vaſquez knewe well that neither moderne diuines nor auncient

auncient Fathers did conclude Matrimonie for a true Sacrament of the Church. And yet the knight could not be ignorant that the ſame authour profeſſedlie defendes the ſame to be trulie and properlie a Sacrament in the third chapter of the verie ſame diſputation which he himſelfe cites: and in his 4. chap. Vaſquez proueth it by the teſtimonies of diuers Fathers, putting for parte of the title of the ſame chap. that the *definition of the Church touching the truth of this Sacrament had foundation in the teſtimonies of the Fathers*, and who will pleaſe to read vaſquez will finde it ſo. In ſo much that Sir Humfrey in this particular is wholelie inexcuſable, eſpeciallie conſidering that out of the place cited nothing can poſſiblie be collected or inferred wherebie it may in anie ſorte be imagined that vaſquez euer dreamed that either auncient Fathers or moderne diuines (excepting durand and perhaps the Maſter of Sentences of whome he ſpeakes doubtfullie, not daring to affirme him abſolutelie to haue beene of the ſame opinion with Durand, as in truth he is not) did conclude matrimonie not to be a true and proper Sacrament, but onelie affirmes that none of the places which diuines alledge out of S. Auguſtin to proue the truth and propertie of that Sacrament, conuince the ſame in the ſenſe in which (ſaith Vaſquez) we now diſpute. Which imagination of Vaſ- Vaſquez de Mat.

quez tho' it were true, as in my iudgement apparentlie it is not, yet doth it not proue *Sir Humfreys intent* in disprouing the septenarie number of Sacraments. Especiallie supposing, as the same Vasquez affirmes, that the fourth Councell of Carthage (in which *S. Augustin was present* as a great member of the same) makes mẽtion of the Benediction of the Preist vsed in mariage as in a holie and sacred thing. Graunt I say that Vasquez opinion were true, yet would it not serue the knights turne, either for the poose of his intent, or for the excuse of his false and craftie dealing.

Cõ. Carth. 4.

Next after Vasquez I will put Suarez álthou' according to the order of Sir Humfrey he is the first man he belies in this Poragraph. in 3, part d. 12. sec. 1. where he charges him to saye that the councell of Florence did insinuate the number of 7. Sacraments, and the councell of Trent did expresselie decree it for an article of faith, yet suarez sayes in plaine termes, that the same was defyned in the councell of Florence. So that here is false dealing with suarez and with the truth to make the point of the septenarie number of Sacraments seeme newe, as ther is also in the wordes following in which the same Sir Humfrey affirmes that the Romanists relie wholely vpon the Tridentine councell.

Propter quod tandem hæc veritas definita est in Con. Flor. in decreto Eugenij quã Græci & Armeni facile cum Latinis suceperũt. Suar. loc. cit.

Ambrose, Austin, Chrysostome and Bede be

be impertinently alleged. For they none of them denie that the Sacraments are no more nor leſſe then ſeuen. And of S. Iſidore it is falſely affirmed by Sir Humfrey that he accounteth but of 3. Sacraments for altho' in the place quoted by him he ſpeakes onely of three (which yet is more then the knight will alowe of) yet doth he not affirme that ther are no more: yea & in other ſeuerall places he mentioneth three more, Pennance, Order, matrimonie. And of them all he treates onely occaſionallie not profeſſedlie as the reader may eaſilie perceiue, and therfore doubtleſſe there is no mention of Extreme vnction among the reſt, of which neuertheleſſe he was not ignorāt how plainelie S. Iames deſcribes it, neither would haue omitted it if occaſiō had ſerued to treate of it. Of Pennance he treates lib. 8. orig. page 83. & lib. 2. de offi. Eccleſ. of Order in his 2. booke de offic. Eccleſ. page 597. and 598. and of matrimonie he hath expreſſe wordes in the ſame booke page 69.

Touching S. Chryſoſtome, Ambroſe, Cyrill and Theophilactus it is falſe that they maintained onely two Sacraments, and as for Chryſoſtome and Theophilactus, vpon the 6. of S. Paule to the Hebrewes, they both make mention of Confirmation. S. Ambroſe lib. 1. de Penit: makes a kynde of compariſon betwixt Baptiſme and Pennance, ſaying: *Vnum in vtro-*

vtroque miniſterium eſt, &c. and S. Cyrill of Ieruſalem lib. 12. in ſo. cap. 56. doth alſoe compare theſe two Sacraments together, and both of them mention the Sacrament of Chriſme. the one *Catech. 3. the other lib. 3. de Sacra. cap. 2. & de iis qui myſteriis initiantur cap. 7.* ſo that none of thes Fathers which Sir Humfrey produced for the number of 2. onely Sacraments, doe agree with his doctrine: and yet more not one of them treates in anie one place of their workes of the preciſe number of Sacraments, but onely ſoe farre as their matter and drift required.

Paſcaſius alſo is falſelie dealt with by Sir Humfrey, both in his meaning and in the tranſlation of his wordes: for the doth not ſaye, the Sacramets of Chriſt are Baptiſme, Chriſme, and the bodie and bloude of our lord, as Sir Humfrey doth put in English but. *Sunt autem Sacramenta Chriſti in Eccleſia:* that is: *but Sacraments of Chriſt in the Church be Baptiſme Chryſme &c.* Meaning onelie that Baptiſme, Chryſme and the Euchariſt are ſuch Sacraments as he treates of makeing mention of thoſe onely, not to showe the preciſe number but the nature of a Sacrament in generall, eſpeciallie touching the ſignification and effects of the ſame, and therfore he doth exemplifie in thoſe onely which are moſt notoriouſlie knowne for ſuch and their matter and formes moſt obuious, omit-

omitting the reſt as being leſſe to the purpoſe he ther handleth. And for Sir Humfrey to affirme that Chriſme is crept in to the text of the later editions, that is but an idle imagination of his owne, other wiſe ſure he would haue produced ſome other more auncient edition in which the worde Chryſme is not found. And certainelie he that should compare the faithfulnes, and ſinceritie of the Romoniſts in that nature, and the care they haue to publish authours purely, with the inſinceritie of the ſectaries, he would preſentlie iudge that copie which wantes the worde Chriſme to be razed by them that haue of late yeares abolished the vſe of it in their Church, rather then haue the leaſt ſuſpicio̅ in the world that the ſame should be added by Romaniſts whoſe doctrine and practice in that particular is ſo frequent and auncient. Eſpecially conſidering that it makes no more to our purpoſe of maintaining the ſeptenarie of Sacraments againſt the pretended reformers, whether the worde Chryſme be in Paſcaſius or no, then if it were vndoubtedlie true that he had made no mention of it. Suppoſing it is ſufficient for vs to knowe that this author in that place neither intended to proue the number of three Sacraments, nor yet to exclude the number of ſeuen. Howbeit, I doe not denie but that the worde Chryſme being in the text, it ſuffices to conuince that the

Sa-

Sacraments of Christ are more then two. And in deed I maruell why the sectaries especiallie those of the English Church should labore so much to exclude Cõfirmation frõ the number of the Sacramẽts, supposing they either doe practice it or at the least ought to practise it according to their owne ordinãces, altho' ther is nothing prescribed by them touching the vse of Chrysme, but onely or cheefelie mẽtion is made of the blowe which the confirmer giues to the confirmed with a certaine phrase or forme of wordes. Concerning which ceremonie I haue heard that vpon a time, a certaine nominall Bishop of theirs at the time of administration, was so extraordinarie well pleased with one of the cõpanie, of the feminine gender, that in steed of the ceremoniall stroake he gaue her a kisse of kindenesse, by which the yonge maide assured her selfe she receiued more grace thẽ if she had receiued Confirmation it selfe accordnig to their ordinarie manner. And now this may be sufficient for the true meaning of Pascasius.

Hugo a sancto Victore is most peruerselie dealt with when out of Perkins he is produced by Sir Humfrey against the Sacrament of Pennance. For I haue read him lib. 1. de Sacramentis cap. 12. where he sayes thus in expresse termes. *Septem sunt principalia Sacramenta quæ in Ecclesia ministrantur.* ther be seuen principall Sacraments which are ministred in the

Church,

Church. And he numbers them in particular and Pennance for one: And in his ſumma ſentent. *tract. 6. cap.* 10. he ſaith. *Sacramentum Pœnitentiæ redeuntibus ad Deum ſemper eſt neceſſarium. Eſt enim ſecunda tabula poſt naufragium, quia poſt baptiſmum ſi quis veſtem innocentiæ peccando amittit per pœnitentiam recuperare poterit.* And by this you plainelie ſee this Romaniſt is groaſlie abuſed both by Perkins, and his imitatour, as if he were a denier of the ſeptenarie number of Sacraments who ſoe particularlie doth acknowledge them. As in like manner the ſame authour is abuſed by the knight page 128. Touching the cuſtome of the communion of the people at euerie Maſſe in the Primatiue Church, by omiſſion of his enſuing wordes which are theſe. *Sed propter peccatum circumſtans nunc ſtatutum eſt vt communicaremus ſolum ſemel in anno.* That is to ſaie. *But by reaſon of ſinne which doth compaſe vs aboute, it is now decreed that we communicate thrice a yeare.* Whereas likewiſe neither in the former wordes of this authour cited by Sir hũfrey, ther is a iot againſt priuate Maſſe, as he would haue it, but onelie a relation of diuers cuſtomes of the Church in that particular point of practice, as I haue declared in the paragraph of that matter.

Beſſariõ in his wordes rehearſed by Sir hũfrey doth not denie the ſeptenarie nũber, nor doth abſo-

absolutely affirme that there are onelie two Sacraméts, but onelie saith that we read of two onely manifestly deliuered in the Gospell: which is not contrarie to the Tridentine Councell, nor yet that which the knight intendes to proue, to wit that the doctrine of seuen Sacraments is no article of faith. And what if Bessarion should saie that some of the seuen Sacraments are found not in the Gospell but in the Epistle, what would Sir Humfrey replie to that? But in earnest I haue vewed Bessarions treatie of the Eucharist where I finde that, altho' he makes no plaine mention of the seuen Sacraments as not hauing anie iuste occasion there offered to handle that matter, yet out of some passages of his discourse with other circumstances there vnto annexed, it is euidentlie gathered what his meaning, and faith was touching the same. For in the place cited by the knight and ther aboutes, Cardinall Bessarion treates particularlie of the forme of the Sacrament of Eucharist, prouing that it consists of no other wordes then those same which our Saniour himselfe consecrated with, and deliuered to the Church videlicet. *This is my bodie*: *This is my bloud*. And by occasion of this he mentioneth Baptisme, as being one of the two Sacraments which onelie haue their formes expresselie and in speciall termes contained in the Gospell and specified by Christ himselfe. And

there-

herefore a little before that which Sir Humfrey cited out of this authour, he saide. *Illud quoque haud contemnendum videtur quod cum duobus Sacramenta à Saluatore tradita fuerint Baptismus & Eucharistia utrumque verbis suis consici iussit*: By which wordes it is certaine & cleare that he there speakes onelie of such Sacraments as our Sauiour most verbally or most expresselie ordained his disciples to consecrate and administer.

And now that this Cardinall did beleeue that there are more Sacraments then these, it is euidentlie conuinced out of those his wordes fol. 169. saying. *Ante omnia igitur sciendum est tam hoc Sacrosanctum Communionis de quo agimus quam cætera Ecclesiæ Sacramenta ideo sacra vocitari, quoniam aliud in se habent quod videtur aliud quod non corporis oculis sed solo intellectu comprehenditur*. And after in the same page. *Etenim in Sacramento Baptismatis ablutio carnis per aquam ita est Sacrementum vt duntaxat signum sit ablutionis peccatorum. Ipsa enim peccatorum remissio res est significata nihil vltra significans*. And to these wordes he presentlie addes that which is plainelie to our purpose, to wit: *Hoc idem in reliquis Sacramẽtis. Ergo & in Sacramento Eucharistia*. And yet more plainelie f. 175. *Quẽadmodum in cæteris omnibus, ita etiam in hoc Sacramento concordes sunt Occidentibus Orientales*. That is, Euen as in all the rest so in this

Sacra-

Sacrament the Occidentals (that is the Romanists) doe accorde with the Orientals) that is the Grecians). Besides, this authour was a Greek Cardinall of the Roman Church, and a cheefe agent, and promoter for the vnion of the Latin and Greek Church in the Councell of Florence, where the number of seuen Sacraments was defined and declared. To omit that the same Bessarion fol. 181. makes expresse mention of the Sacrament of Confirmation for so he saith. *Quod manifestum fiet si quis ad Sacramentum Chrysmatis mentem conuerterit.* So that Sir Humfrey could scarce a chosen a worse Patron for proofe of his pare of deformed Sacraments, then is this Cardinall, if he had sought all Greece ouer: it being manifest that he was a professed defender not onelie of the two Sacraments he mentioneth in the place cited by him, but also a firme beleeuer of the other fiue which the pretended reformers renounce & thrust violentlie out of the rancke of true Sacraments. It is true I haue aduertised some smale sleight of Sir Humfrey in translating or transforming the worde manifeste in Latin, into the worde plainelie in English: but this but one of his diminutiue trickes and so I passe it ouer. Onelie I desire the indifferent reader to reflect how peruers and incredulous a generation this is which refuseth to beleeue points of doctrine because they are

not

not manifeſtelie contained in the ſcripture? Whereas on the contrarie this moſt learned and Catholike Cardinall Beſſarion altho' he graunted that two onelie Sacraments of the Church are ſo expreſſed in the written worde of God, yet doth he with a firme and conſtant faith imbrace the reſt.

S. Aug. is impertinētlie cited both in his third booke of Chriſtian doctrine c. 9. and alſo *de ſimbolo ad Cathecu.* l. 2. c. 6. in regarde that in neither of the places he ſpeakes of two onely Sacramēts as his wordes cited by Sir Humfrey himſelfe doe manifeſt. Nay in the latter place he ſpeakes not at all of proper Sacraments, as his wordes following faithleſlie omitted by our aduerſarie, doe declare, for thus S. Auſtin finisheth his ſentence. *Aqua in qua eſt ſponſa purificata, & ſanguis in quo inuenitur eſſe dotata:* That is, water in which the ſponſe is purified, and bloud in which she is founde to be endowed: in which paſſage no mention is made of anie of the ſeuen Sacraments, as the reader may plainelie perceiue.

Of S. Cypriā I ſaie the ſame I ſaide of S. Ambroſe, Auſtin & the reſt. And yet more, I know Sir Hūfrey will be loath to graūt fiue Sacramēts as S. Cyprian doth altho' we ſhould giue him leaue to put the lotion of feet for one, as S. Ambroſe did put it for an vnproper Sacrament. Vid. lib. de operib. Card. ſub nom. Cypr.

Dominicus à toto cited out of Bellarmin cap. 4. de

4. *de Sacramento Ordinis* doubteth not of Order in generall, but he onelie makes a queſtion of Epiſcopall Order in particular, whether it be trulie a Sacrament: and ſo he is ignorantlie and impertinentlie here alledged, with abuſe both of him and the reader. As in like manner Suarez or rather Hugo, Lombard, Bonauenture, Hales, and Altiſiodor. Of whome altho' Suarez Tom. 4. *de Sacramento Extremæ Vnctionis* affirmes that they were of opinion that Extreme Vnction was not inſtituted by Chriſt, but by S. Iames from whence ſuarez ſaith id plainelie followes not to be a true Sacrament, yet ſuarez himſelfe addes (which Sir Humfrey fraudulentlie left out) that thoſe authours denied the conſequence. By which it is manifeſt that thoſe diuines abſolutelie beleeued Extreme Vnction for one of the ſeuen Sacraments: notobſtanding their material errour aboute the inſtitution of it, which errour being impertinent to this preſent queſtion of the ſeptenarie number of Sacraments, their teſtimonie was impertinentlie alledged and proueth nothing to our aduerſaries purpoſe.

S. Bonauẽture alſo is abuſed by the knight p. 165. where out of Chamier he carps him ſaying: that for wante of better proofes, he was prodigall of his conceiptes in honour of the ſeptenarie number of Sacraments. But here I finde greater prodigalitie in the dishoneſte proceeding

ding of Sir Humfrey, and his maſter miniſter chamier in their iniuſte taxeing of Bonauenture, then I finde wante of proofes in that authour, for if either Chamier or the knight had beene diſpoſed, they might haue found warrantable allegations in him out of ſcripture for the probation of euerie Sacrament in particular as his ſeuerall queſtions vpon them doe teſtifie. But theſe men being much more diſpoſed to cauille then to finde the truth: they would not caſte their eyes ſo farre, but onelie layed handes vpon that which came neareſt in their waye, I meane vpon ſome of the congruences onelie (and yet purpoſelie omitting the cheefe) which that pious diuine makes vſe of more for explication then for proofe of the doctrine. And thus theſe ill occupied Pedants triſle with him who had more learning, and grauitie, without compariſon, then they and their whole Congregation nor yet had they both wit to cite the place they alledged trulie, but quoted the ſecond booke for the fourth.

Iuſte according to this manner of proceeding the knight alſo dealeth with S. Thomas, the Councell of Trent, and Bellarmin and others, as if they had beene ſo deſtitute of arguments of ſcripture and Fathers for their proofes of the ſeuen Sacraments, that they were glad to refuge to figures and ſimilitudes of ſeuen virtues, ſeuen capitall vices, ſeuen planets, ſeuen

defects proceeding from Originall sinne, seuen dayes of vnleauened bread, the offering of seuen Rams, seuen lauers of naaman, seuen candlestickes, seuen seales, seuen bookes and the like: whereas in truth these mysticall numbers are applied to the seuen Sacraments by the foresaid authours whereby to confirme and declare the matter more plainelie ouer and aboue their other most pregnant and authenticall proofes of the same as in them all and particularlie in S. Thomas, and bellarmin, is too plainelie to be seene in their workes, to be brought in question by anie one of reading and vnderstanding; S. Thomas hauing seuen seuerallie distinct questions of the seuen Sacraments a parte, besides that he hath of them in generall: and the like I say of Bellarmin. And as for the Councell of Trent it either produceth proofes of scripture and Fathers actuallie for euerie particular Sacrament, or remittes the reader to other former Councells and decrees which haue them. And so wee see by this that Sir Humfrey doth but cogge and trifle for wante of solid subiect.

Touching the citation of Caietan vpon the 5. cap. of S. Iames, it is true I finde the same which Sir Humfrey relates at the least in sense, and so I cannot accuse him in this place of the ordinarie imperfection which he vseth in citing authours. Neuertheless he might easilie

haue

haue knowne that the ſame Caietan in his Commentarie vpon the 65. queſtion of the 3. parte of S. Thomas art. 1. doth agree with him in the ſeptenarie number of Sacraments: and therefore in his gloſſe vpon the ſecond article of that ſame queſtion he numbers Extreme Vnction for one of the ſeuen, ſaying: [*In titulo intellige per ordinem prædictum, ordinem quo numerata ſunt Sacramenta in præcedenti articulo. videlicet Baptiſma, Confirmatio, Euchariſtia, Pœnitentia; Extrema Vnctio, Ordo, Matrimonium*. By which it is manifeſt that Caietan defended with his maſter S. Thomas Extreme Vnction to be a Sacrament, and conſequentlie he is no fauourer of Sir Humfrey in this point of which now we treat. And the ſame I ſaye of the ſame Caietan alledged by the knight as ſaying that the reader cannot inferre out of the wordes of S. Paule, *Sacramentum hoc magnum eſt*, that matrimonie is a Sacrament, becauſe ſainct Paule ſaith not, *Sacramentum hoc magnum eſt, ſed myſterium hoc magnum eſt*. But what ſoeuer out of the predominating ſubtiltie of his wit, Caietan held of the interpretation of this place of ſainct Paule: in which as alſo in the expoſition of ſome other ſcriptures, he is noted and notorious to haue beene more ſubtil then ſolid, yet certaine it is that he abſolutelie defended Matrimonie to be one of the ſeuen Sacraments of the Church as both his wordes

aboue cited doe manifeſtlie conuince, and alſo the great pũctuality with which he is knowne to haue obſerued and followed his much reſpected and reuerenced Patron ſainct Thomas in all points of doctrine, ſwearing in a manner euerie where in the wordes of his maſter; ſo that the knight cannot haue as much as anie conlorable reaſon to imagin that Caietan ſtandes for him in this matter and againſt the Romaniſts: As neither he hath to conceiue the like of Canus, whome he in the ſame manner cites asif we were a denier of matrimonie to be a Sacrament, or at the leaſt a teſtifier that other diuines pronounce doubtfullie of the ſame: whereas in reallitie Canus in defence of his owne priuate opinion that matrimonie is not a Sacrament nor conferreth grace except when it is adminiſtred by a Preiſt, doth onelie name ſome diuines which varie in their opinions concerning the determinate matter& forme of matrimonie, and touching the mãner how or whẽ it giues grace, yet both he and the reſt conſtantlie & expreſſely teaching, that abſolutelie it hath both matter and forme and giues graces in one ſorte or other, and numbering it among the reſt of the ſeuen Sacraments as their writings doe teſtifie. So that it was great prepoſterouſneſſe in Sir Humfrey to vſe the teſtimonie of Canus againſt the truth of the Sacrament of Matrimonie ſince neither he

nor

nor thoſe other diuines which he names viz. Lombard, Scotus, ſainct Thom. Ricard. Palud. Durand. Except they be detorted from their true ſenſe and meaning can poſſiblie be imagined to haue beene others then profeſſed Patrons and aſſertours of the whole ſeptenarie number of Sacraments, as by all or moſt of their owne wordes cited by me in other places, may euidentlie appeare to the reader. Vid. Magiſtrum. in 4. & vid. S. Th. in 3. part. q.

And theſe being all the authors which the knigth cites is this paragraffe, or at the leaſt all that deſerue anſer, we may plainelie ſee that notobſtanding all the arte and skill which he hath vſed to make them ſeeme his owne, yet the Roman faith touching the ſeuen Sacraments of the Churche ſtandes ſtill firmelie auncient, vniuerſall, and viſible, which is that he intended to deſtroy, and I maintaine.

Whence we may inferre for the cõcluſion & cenſure thereof, that all which our aduerſarie bringeth in it to proue that there is neither antiquitie, nor vniuerſalitie in the Fathers, nor conſent in the ſchoolemen (as he ſpeaketh) ſufficient to shew the ſeuen Sacraments to be inſtituted by Chriſt, is meare Sophiſtrie, founded vpon his owne miſinterpretations, falſifications, and corruptions of the authours he citeth, and that conſequentlie his owne conditionall curſe is abſolutelie fallen vpon him, in which we muſt of neceſſitie leaue him

till ſuch time as by humble recantation of his errours he ſhall deſire abſolution.

And now hence I paſſe to the next Paragraffe which is of the Communion vnder one kinde. In which the knight by a ſpeciall parentheſis which he makes in his 172. page, peruerſely perſuades his reader that the foreſaid manner of Communion in one kinde, was decreed as it were in diſpite of God and man by the Coũcell of Conſtance, & that from the time of that Coũcell the Cõmunion vnder both kindes was adiudged hereſie, which is not ſo, for the Roman Church doth not teach that the communion in both kindes is hereticall, but onely that it is hereſie to condemne the communion in one kinde for vnlawfull, or repugnant to Chriſts inſtitution, and ſo his poſition is both falſe and calumnious, as appeares not onely by the decree of the ſame councell, but alſo by the tenour of the decree of the Councell of Trent neither of which councels defined communion in both kindes either conformable or diſconformable to anie precept of either God or man in the nature of faith, but they onely declare the practiſe of the communion in one kinde as a thing not vnlawfull, or cõtrarie to Chriſts inſtitution or precept, but otherwiſe conueniẽt for the preſent ſtate of the Church, in reſpect of the reuerence due to the Sacrament: and for other iuſte cauſes alſo condemning them that

Si quis dixerit ex Dei præcepto, vel neceſsitate ſalutis

shall

shall affirme that all and euerie faithfull person is bound to receiue both kindes either by the commaundement of God, or as necessarie to saluation by vertue of Christs institution: or that the communion in one kinde is vnlawfully appointed by the Church, or that the Church did erre therein. Which doctrine is so plainely declared by the two foresaid Councels and especially by the Councell of Trent, and so often repeated and inculcated by moderne diuines, (to say nothing of the more auncient) that if our aduersaries were not ouer much disposed to cauill they would neuer haue the face to calumniate the same by their misconstructions, as Sir Humfrey doth in this place. The knight cites some ten or eleuen Roman diuines, and among them to increase the number he foysteth in Cassander, whom yet he either knowes or ought to know he is none of ours: but the matter is not great becauſe neither he nor the rest teach any thing here, cõtrarie to the doctrine of the Romã Church in this point: but they onely relate the custome of the Primatiue Church to haue beene that the lay people commonly receiued in both kindes: yet not denying but that the same succeeding Church hath vpon iuste reasons altered that manner of communion. Yea and the same authours here cited defending the lawfullnes thereof either in the verie same or in other places of their workes: nay and some

omnes & singulos Christi fideles vtrãque speciẽ sãctiſsimi Eucharistiæ sacramenti sumere debere, anathema sit. Cõc. Trid. de cõmun. sub vtraq. specie. can. 1. vid. can. 2.

Caſſander. consult. de vtraque ſpecie.

ſome of them if not all, teaching with all that ſome times the communion in one kinde was practized in anncient ages, ſo that it was great madneſſe in Sir Humfrey to produce then either as confeſſers of want of antiquitie and vniuerſalitie in the Roman Church, or for the proofe of them in the doctrine of the pretenſiue reformed Churches, ſince that out of their teſtimonies, as shall be declared, neither the one nor the other can with anie colorable probabilitie poſſible be collected: and for this reaſon and becauſe I haue in an other place anſered what our aduerſarie can ſay in this matter, I knowe I haue no need to proceed to particulars, but onelie pronounce my ſentence of this whole Paragraph in generall termes: yet becauſe I finde all, or manie of the authours cited to haue their ſentences and meaning mangled and peruerted, therefore I deemed it conuenient to giue the reader notice in particular of the authours ill proceeding. And firſt altho' Vaſquez with ſome others, is of a contrarie opinion to Taper & manie other diuines to wit houlding as more probable that thoſe who receiue the Sacrament in both kindes doe receiue ſome more ſpirituall frute then the receiuers of one alone, yet neither doth he condemne the contrarie opinion and practice, nor yet doth he conclude that it is abſolutelie better or ſafer for the laytie to receiue both formes then.

then one onelie: but rather defendes the quite contrarie expreſſelie in his 216. diſputation and laſt chapter: where notobſtanding his owne opinion defended in one of his former queſtions, yet he ſolues the ſectaries argument in this latter place, and ſo cleareth the difficultie of their obiection, that it is impoſſible for Sir Humfrey or anie of his confederates to gather anie thing in fauour of their poſition out of that authour, as his owne wordes doe make apparent to the reader of them, as here I place them in the margen.

Licēt ſecundum aliquorū opinionē quam precedenti diſput: defendi, laici aliquo fructu priuētur dum ipſis calix denegatur, tamen cū ſumentes tantum vnam ſpeciem nulla gratia neceſſaria ad ſalutem careāt (vt notauit Conciliū) omiſsis alijs cauſis poſtulantibus, rectè potuit Eccleſia laicis alterā ſpeciem denegare. Vaſq. to. 3. in 3 p. diſput. 216. cap. vlt.

Salmeron is abuſed by Sir Humfrey in regarde he takes onelie ſome certaine wordes of his which ſeeme to make for his purpoſe, and omits others which make againſt him which follow in the verie next leafe, and doe ſo temper the ſenſe of the former that taking them together neither the one nor the other fauoure the reformed doctrine. For thus he ſaith. *Nos enim &c. For we quoth hee, doe ſo confeſſe the cuſtome to haue beene of communicating the laye people vnder both kindes, that yet allwayes in ſome caſes, the vſe of one kinde hath beene practized.* Which wordes quite dashe Sir Humfreys deſigne of prouing that the Church of Rome in this particular, hath created a newe article of faith manifeſtlie repugnant to Chriſts worde, inſtitution, & practice of the primatiue Churh, except hee will be ſo audacious as to condemne here

herealso of ſacriledge for her practice in thoſe caſes, as he doth our preſent Church. In which paſſage I much wonder at the ſlownes of him that otherwiſe vſeth to be ſo nimble and actiue as that in this place he tooke not paines to turne one leafe further for the diſcouerie of the truth. And the ſame I ſay of Valentia who ſpeakes iuſte to the ſame ſenſe and purpoſe *de legit, vſu Euchariſtiæ cap.* 10. as alſo did Father Fisher and Caſtro in the places cited by our aduerſarie.

And as for ſainct Thomas vpon the 6. of ſainct Iohn. And Iyra in 1. Cor. 11., they neither of them diſproue communion in one kinde, as Sir Humfrey doth alledge, but expreſſelie defendit. S. Thomas relates that the cuſtome of the auncint Church was to communicate in both formes which cuſtome he ſaith was obſerued euen till his dayes in ſome Churches where alſo, quoth hee, the miniſters of the altar doe continuallie communicate the bodie & bloud. But for danger of effuſiõ, ſaith he, in ſome Churches it is obſerued that the Preiſt onelie receiue the bloud, and the reſt the bodie. Neither is this, ſaith he, contrarie to the ſentence of our Lord, becauſe he that communicates the bodie, communicates alſo the bloud, ſince that Chriſt is whole in both the ſpecies or kindes euen in reſpect of both his bodie and bloud. Thus ſainct Thomas. By which it is cleare howe farre he was from patronizing

Vide S. Thom. in 3. part.

Sir Humfreys new tenet maintaining that the communiō of the laitie in the Roman Church is but a halfe communion.

Now touching Lyra, Sir Humfrey hath deceiptfullie omitted thoſe wordes of his, which include the verie reaſon & approbation of the change which the Roman Church hath made, it being the ſame which ſainct Thomas alledgeth in parte as his wordes in the margen declare. So that both theſe authours are ſo plaine againſt Sir Humfrey, and for vs, that a man may almoſt perceiue that he now repents that euer he cited them, as alſo the authours following. To the wordes of Arboreus: *but now the communion of both kyndes is abolished*: Sir Humfrey ought to haue added that authours reaſon of the abolishment, to wit this. *For the ſcandals which haue happened, and which yet may happen.* And the like I ſay of Taper, to whoſe wordes should haue beene ioyned that which followes, videlicet. *This communion of the people in both kindes hath danger of Sacriledge annexed vnto it in sheding the bloud of Chriſt, and in the omiſſion of the chalis no danger doth occurre nor anie loſſe of Spirituall grace.*

The Councell of Conſtance is impertinentlie alledged as I haue declared before. Bellarmin in the ſame place and wordes cited by Sir Humfrey, doth directlie impugne that for which he is alledged by the knight, to wit for the

Fit autem hic mentio de duplici ſpecie, nā in primitiua Eccleſia ſic dabatur fidelibus: ſed propter periculū effuſionis ſanguinis, modo datur tantū ſub ſpecie panis. Sacerdos tamen celebrans accipit ſub vtraque ſpecie non tantum pro ſe ſed etiam pro alijs Lira. in 1. Cor. 11.

Propter ſcandala quæ contigerunt, & adhuc contingere poſſūt. Arb.

Theoſ. lib. 3. 11.

the Communion of all the people in both kindes. For ſo he ſaith. *And beſides, all did not receiue in both kindes.* As for Caſſander altho' we haue him not in the rancke of Romaniſts; yet for anie thing I can perceiue, hee doth not abſolutelie ſtand for Sir Humfrey in the ſubſtance of this Controuerſie, as neither houlding it abſolutelie neceſſarie for the laytie to communicate in both kyndes, nor yet contrarie to Chriſts inſtitution, as his owne wordes in that treatie page 1046. Doe plainelie either ſuppoſe or inſinuate. And for as much as concernes priuate or extraordinarie communion, he himſelfe relates diuers examples of it. So that the reader may perceiue how ſmale reaſon Sir Humfrey hath to vſe Caſſanders authoritie for diuers reſpects in this matter, eſpeciallie if he conſider his owne drift in this place, altho' I cannot denie but the ſame Caſſander leanes vnto him, in that he deſires the preſent practice of the Roman Church might be changed as leſſe perfect & legitimate then the contrarie, in his conceipte.

Bellar. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 24.

Ex his itaque conſici puto hanc integram in vtraque panis & vini communicationē etſi ſimpliciter neceſſaria non habeatur, ei cōmunicationi qnæ in altera tantū ſpecie fit, etiamſi mandato contraria non putetur, multis nominibus eſſe anteponēdam &c. Caſſ. loco cit.

And this being all I need to ſay touching the teſtimonies of the cited authours and of Sir Humfreyes proceedings about them, I will now conclude the cenſure of this whole Paragraph; that directly it containeth nothing which requires ſo exacte a diſcuſſion as I haue made of it. And that I haue oftentimes marualled why the reformers ſhould ſtand ſo per-

emptorily againſt the Communion in one kinde, ſuppoſing that euen according to their owne *principles*, neither the words of Chriſt nor the intention of the miniſter, nor both theſe together, are of force and efficacy to make any change or alteration in the matter of the Sacrament, but that when they haue ſaid and done all they can, they ſhall remaine bread & wine as truely as if they had receaued them in the tauerne; eſpecially if we conſider yet farther that, according to the reformed doctrine, the intention of the miniſter is not neceſſarily required to the conſtitution of any Sacrament; and yet without the ſame it is cleerly vnpoſſible to conceiue how the Euchariſt can be receaued by them in remembrance of the death and paſſion of Chriſt more in both the formes of bread and wine then in one alone, eſpecially ſuppoſing that by virtue of the inſtitution and commaunde of Chriſt each of them in particular is to be receiued in memorie of him. And this I ſay hath cauſed me many times to wonder, euen yet perſuading my ſelfe the Nouelliſts can haue no other motiue then the ſatisfaction of their owne contentious ſpirits, to ſtand ſo nicely vpon this puntillio with the Church of Rome; which refractory proceeding of thē in this matter may yet ſeeme more vnreaſonable to the reader if he conſider that, altho' Vaſquez and ſome other Romane diuines are of opinion

that

that greater fruites of grace are reaped by the communion in both kindes then in one, yet doth it not thence followe that the communion in one kinde cannot be lawfully practized, as our Preciſians will needes haue it, nor yet that the communion vnder one kinde is but a halfe Communion, as the knight doth heere malitiouſly inculcate; but in either of the two kinds it is moſt euident there is a perfect and intire Sacrament according to the true definition thereof, in regard there is found in either of the conſecrated formes a viſible ſigne of an inuiſible grace inſtituted by God: as alſo becauſe the body of Chriſt euen according to the tenet of our aduerſaries being truely, really and ſubſtantially receiued vnder the forme of bread onely altho' they meane onely by faith; it doth follow infallibly that vnleſſe they graunt that Chriſt can dye againe by ſeparatiõ of his bloud from his body, or that his perfect and intire body is not there receaued but onely a part of it: it doth I ſay neceſſarily follow that vnder the forme of bread alone there is Chriſts bloud with his body, and ſo a perfect communion of them both receaued in that one kinde.

The Parahraph following is about prayer and ſeruice in an vnknowne tongue, in which point Sir Humfrey ſaith true in that he affirmeth that the Roman Church celebrates Maſſe and publick ſeruice in Latin, and it is alſo true that the Councell of Trent hath de-

clared it not to be expedient that it be celebrated euerie where in the vulgar language. But yet it is falſe to ſay that either the Church or Councell hath commaunded it to be celebrated in an vnknowne language; for Latin cannot trulie be ſaid to be an vnknowne language, but rather it is a generall language, a knowne ſpeech, more vſed then anie one language in the world: And altho' it be not vnderſtood of the ignorant ſort of people, yet it is leſſe vncoth vnto them, then anie other language excepting their owne mother tongue, yea then anie other publike language, I meane then either hebrew or greeke, and finallie it is a language fitter for mutuall communication in religion then anie other tongue, and among the more learned ſort of people of all nations, the moſt familiar of all. And I would faine knowe of the reformers what they haue to doe to call that in queſtion which hath binne generallie practiſed in the Church for manie hundred yeeres before they and their reformation were hatched. Who appointed them for iudges in this matter? Let them meddle in their owne affaires, their cauſe is not ours, we are all one both in our religion, and in the forme, and rites of our religion; we communicate with all the members of our Church euen in the ſame externall Ceremonies in what place ſoeuer they be, and they with vs. But you in England haue

built

built a new Church different euen from the reſt of the pretended reformed Churches of other Countries; you are not vniforme, neyther in doctrine nor Ceremonies, and ſo it is not amiſſe for your purpoſe that you vſe a language in your publick ſeruice in which you as little agree with your brothers as in your religion: Nay in my opinion ſuppoſing your ſeparation in communion of religion, you haue taken a politick courſe to ſeparate your ſelues alſo in the language of your ſeruice, otherwiſe it might happen vnto you and your French and dutch brothers, as it hath donne alreadie betweene the Gūmariſts and Arminians, (eſpeciallie now whē Arminianiſme begins to ſpred itſelfe) who are knowne to haue entered into the Church with zealous communication one with another and yet the feruour of their ſpirits hath ſo much increaſed, that before the ſermon was ended, there hath appeered good ſtore of broken pates and perhaps worſe; for auoyding of which inconueniencies our English Nouelliſts as it may be ſuppoſed haue their ſeuerall Churches and formes of ſeruice, and doctrine for themſelues, the French, and the Dutch: whereas one the contrarie the profeſſours of the Romane Church by reaſon of their publick ſeruice or Maſſe is in a common language, are put to no ſuch ſhifts, but whereſoeuer they meet, they finde meanes to ſerue

God

God and to communicate together in the verie ſame manner they doe in their owne Coũtries, whether they be old or yong, learned, or ignorant; of which great comfort the reformers by reaſon of their new forme of ſeruice in the vulgar tongue, in manie occaſions doe wilfully depriue themſelues. To ſay nothing of the dignitie which the ſeruice of God receiueth from the grauitie of the Latine tongue, and the diſparagement which it ſuffereth by a vulgar language, ſuppoſing alſo that by that meanes euen the ſecret miſteries of the Chriſtian faith come to be as familiar in the mouthes of euerie apish boy as they be to the greateſt Doctour of the Church, a thing both much repugnant to the practiſe of *auncient times*, and alſo which giueth great occaſion to manie to viliſie, and diſeſteeme the ſacred wordes of God included in the publike ſeruice; yea and oftentimes the thinges themſelues by the wordes ſignified, as experience doth daily teach vs: to omit the alteration & corruption which it is more ſubiect vnto in a vulgar tongue then in Latine, which is alwaies the ſame, as the ſame experience doth make manifeſt.

But Sir Humfrey goeth on, and tells his reader, that ſome of the Trent Biſhops adiudged the firſt part of the decrec of the Councell to be queſtionable, for that it ſeemed to contradict itſelfe in that it affirmeth the Maſſe to

 containe

containe much inſtruction for the faithfull, and yet commaundeth that parte of the ſeruice to be vttered with a lowe voyce, and in an vnknowne tongue, and for this, for want of better authours, he citeth the hiſtorie of the Councell of Trent. But all this is but a meere cauill grounded in the relation of a falſe hiſtoriographer: for that if anie ſuch thing had happened after the foreſaid decree was once confirmed, it is not ſo long a time ſince the Councell was finiſhed, but that the fact of thoſe Bishops would haue binne knowne to the world, yea and their punishment for ſuch their temeritie, if they had remayned refractorie, would haue binne ſo published, as at the leaſt ſome one or other writer would haue taken notice of the ſame, as well as the authour of that relation: neyther is their anie contradiction in the ſaid decree, in regard it is manifeſt that by the inſtruction of the people, the Councell meaneth eyther wholie or cheeflie the epiſtle & Goſpell of the Maſſe; as alſo for that the ſame Councell withall doth expreſſelie giue Order that the Paſtours of the Church interpret and declare the miſteries of the Maſſe to their pariſhoners, which order taketh away all colour of contradiction which can be imagined in the wordes of the decree; eſpeciallie ſuppoſing that in what language or with what voice ſoeuer the Maſſe be celebrated, the foreſaid expoſition

position will supplie all the obscuritie which from thence can arise. But how be it this which I haue said is true: yet I haue discouered by reading that passage in the foresaid Historie, that it doth not so relate it, but quite in an other manner, for that historie doth not affirme that the Tridentine Bishops made that doubt or question of the decree which ordaineth the celebration of Masse in a lowe voyce and vnknowne language as ambiguous in the construction: but the historie saith expresselie that the Protestants made that doubt by way of obiection, to which the Bishops answered in that forme which the same historie relates. Which is so foule a falsification in Sir Humfrey that I confesse I had smale mynde to make anie further examen of the rest of the citations of this booke if otherwise I had not alreadie so farre engaged my selfe. Let the reader suruey the 650. page of the Trid. historie printed in Latine at Franckford 1621. and he will easilie finde the deceipte. And now you see this is but a fiction of a contradiction deuised in discredit of the doctrine of the Councell in this point either by the knight, or some other Sycophāt of ſ home he receiued it vpon truste. Besides that if anie such thing had happened in the time of the discussion of the doctrine of the Councell, yet certaine it is that all such doubt was cleered and quite taken away by the establishment of

Mandat ſancta Synodus paſtoribus & ſingulis curam animarum gerentibus vt frequēter inter miſſarum celebrationē vel per ſe vel per alios ex iſs quæ in Miſſa leguntur aliquid exponant &c. Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 22. cap. 8.

the decree itſelfe; whence it alſo appeereth how falſe a conſequence Sir Humfrey deduceth out of the ſame decree, to wit that becauſe the Conncell affirmeth that the Maſſe doth affoard great inſtruction to the people, and for that end ought to be interpreted vnto them, therefore ſayth the knight the Fathers of the Conncell doe conſequentlie affirme that the ſeruice and prayer in the reformed Churches in the vulgar tongue was better for the edification of the Church. For it is manifeſt out of the verie ſame place cited by our aduerſarie himſelfe that the Councell of Trent doth command that the Paſtours doe frequently expoũd ſome parte of thoſe things which are read in the Maſſe, not for that it hauing decreed the contrarie, could poſſiblie hold it better to haue the Maſſe in a vulgar language then otherwiſe, but becauſe that, ſuppoſing for other reaſons it was better for the Church the Maſſe ſhould not be in a vulgar tongue, and that beſides this, it includeth matter of great inſtruction for the faithfull people, therefore the Councell prudentlie decreed not for one onelie, but for both theſe cauſes, that it ſhould oftentimes by the Paſtours and Preiſts be declared to the common people for their greater edification and better vnderſtanding of the doctrine contayned in it. And this is all that in ſubſtance the Councell eyther ſayth, or from

the

the wordes of the decree can be trulie inferred; and ſo, that from the Romaniſts owne confeſſion it can be gathered that the ſeruice and prayer in the vulgar tongue was better for the edification of the Church, is but ſuch a dreame as Sir Humfrey vſeth to haue the night before whenſoeuer he citeth the Councell of Trent in fauour of the reformed doctrine.

After this the knight endeuoureth to proue that the Maſſe ought not to be celebrated in a ſilent and vnknowne voyce, becauſe ſayth he the Apoſtles were cõmanded to showe forth the Lords death till his comming: and to this end he citeth Haymo vpon the 14. chapter of the firſte to the Corinth, and Iuſtinian the Emperour in Nou. Conſt. out of Caſſander, alſo the Greg. Decet. Tit. 31. de Off. Iud. Ord. cap. 14. But to this I anſwere that both the knights reaſon and the teſtimonies of theſe authours are impertinent, becauſe the command layd vpon the Apoſtles was not that in this miſterie they should shewe forth Chriſts death in words, but principallie indeedes, and therefore our Sauiour in the inſtitution of the Euchariſt did not bid his Apoſtles, ſay it in remembrance of him, but doe it in remembrance of him. *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*. Otherwiſe the Sectaries themſelues should be conuinced to violate Chriſtes commaundement, ſince that thoſe who receiue their communion ſay

not one worde. In like manner let the reader veiw and vnderſtand perfectlie the ſenſe of the the wordes cited out of other authours, and he will eaſilie perceaue there is not one ſillable in them againſt Latine ſeruice or prayer as condemning it eyther for vnlawfull in itſelfe or otherwiſe contrarie to the commandement of God. Haymo doth onelie comment vpon that paſſage of ſainct Paul 1. Cor 14. *If I am ignorant of the virtue of the voyce, I ſhall be to him to whome I ſpeake barbarous*, onelie declaring in playner words that which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh breiflie and obſcurelie, but ſayth not a worde againſt the office of the Church in Latin. Iuſtinian (if anie ſuch conſtitution he made, of which it is much doubted, by reaſon this clauſe is not founde in the auncient tranſlation, neither is it expounded by Cuiacio) ordaineth onelie in generall that Bishops, and Preiſts celebrate the oblation, and miniſter the Sacraments of Baptiſme and the Euchariſt *non tacito modo not ſecretlie*, bnt with a lowde voice; but he ſpeaketh not in particular of all partes of the Maſſe, and at the leaſt he ſpeaketh not of the Canon except he meanes of the wordes of conſecration which the Romaniſts doe not denie but the Grecians haue a cuſtome of pronouncing them loude. And as for other partes of the Maſſe, the moſt of them are pronounced commonlie in the Romane Church ſo that

the

the auditours may heere. And according to this Iuſtinian peraduenture might aduiſe the Preiſtes of his time to doe, when neuertheleſſe it is certaine the Maſſe was in no vulgar language. The decretalls ſpeake not of anie vulgar tongue but onelie of Greeke and Latin, as, the decree of Innocent the third which may be ſeene in the ninth chap. of the Generall Councell of Lateran, doth declare. Neyther doth the Roman Church ſo ſtrictlie command that the publike ſeruice be miniſtred in the Latine tongue, that she doth condemne eyther the Greeke or Syrian Church for vſing the Grecian or Caldaian tongue in the diuine offices or publike ſeruice, but onelie commandeth as more couenient that they be not performed in a vulgar language.

Laſtly Sir Humfrey citeth ſome eight or nine Romaniſts who confeſſe (ſayth he) that in the firſt ages publike prayers were vſed for the vnderſtāding of the people. But to omit that he vſeth no great ſinceritie in the citation and tranſlatiō of the teſtimonies of ſome of the authours he citeth in this paragraph, as may appeere particularlie in the quoration of Waldenſis; I ſay not to ſtand here vpon this which I shall more conuenientlie examen afterwardes: I anſwere, that thoſe authours affirme that which we doe not denie, to wit, that perhaps (which worde Sir Humfrey deceitfullie leaues out in

In 1. Cor. 14. lect. 3. his translation of S. Tho. testimonie cited out of his 3. lection vpon 1. Cor. 14.) the case of the primitiue Church was different from the practise of the ptesent time in this matter: yet withall the same authours doe affirme that the alteration was made vpon iust causes, which causes are so sufficientlie deliuered by Bellarmine and others, euen those whome the knight heere citeth, that I need not rehearse their reasons they being so easilie to be found as they are to those that reade their bookes: And altho' sainct Thomas aduertiseth his reader, that it might haue seemed madnesse in the primitiue Church to haue performed all the Ecclesiasticall offices in the Latine tongue, for that they were rude & ignorãt in the rites of the Church and ceromonies, yet doth he adde that now all are so well instructed that tho' it be in Latine, the people vnderstands what is donne in the Church: whose saying is most true, at least in generall yea and in particular so farre as is necessarie for euerie person, state, and vocation; for that throu' the diligence of their pastours and preachers, and their owne industrie, they may haue sufficient instruction. Howbeit that if it were necessarie for euerie one that prayes or sings to vnderstand all they say, the Puritans themselues might put vp their pipes, it being most certainely true that there be manie things in the psalmes which they sing so merilie, and

in

in the ſcriptures which they read ſo readilie, which by reaſon of their great obſcuritie they cannot poſſiblie vnderſtand euen in their owne mother tongue. And from hence I paſſe to a breefe Suruey of the reſt of the authors cited in this paragraph, among which I finde Caſſander in the firſt rancke of corruption: for altho' the teſtimonies which Caſſander cites doe not proue fully his intent yet is it euident by the wordes of thoſe he produceth that he ſpeakes in that places of the Canon of the Maſſe eſpeciallie when he ſayes in the title of his chapter *canonicam precem &c.* And Sir Humfrey tranſlates it not the Canō of the Maſſe as he ought to haue done, but Canonicall prayers, ſo odious and reformidable vnto him is the reporte of that great Canon that he durſt not name it. Moreouer the teſtimonie of Caſſander is detorted by Sir Humfrey quite from the ſenſe in which he ſpeakes it. For he ſpeakes not there of the vulgar tongue one worde, but whether the Canon of the Maſſe ought to be pronounced with a lowde voyce (eſpeciallie the conſecration) that the people may heare it and anſer, Amen.

Conſequitur ergo Canonem clare & aperte legendū vt ad gratiarum actionem Sacerdotis populus reſpōdeat, Amen. Caſſander. ex Gerardo Lorichio p. 65.

And the ſame I (or Caſſander forme me) anſer to the conſtitution of Iuſtinian which Caſſander himſelfe alledges to that ſame purpoſe and in no other ſenſe. And ſo in like manner the wordes of the Decretals are violentlie drawe

to a

to a ſenſe repugnant to the authors meaning that is from doctrinall tongues to vulgar languages.

To the wordes of Lyra, if he had dealt ſincerelie, Sir Humfrey ought to haue added thoſe which immediatlie enſue and explicate his minde more clearelie: *Sed poſtquam populus multiplicatus fuit & conſueuit ſe conformare miniſtris Eccleſiæ vtpote ſtando cum dicitur Euangelium depoſito caputio adorando Euchariſtiam, & conſimilia fiunt in Eccleſia Latina in Latino, & ſufficit quod Clericus reſpondeat pro populo, expeditius enim fit hoc modo quam in vulgari. But ſince the people increaſed and is accuſtomed to conforme it ſelfe to the miniſters of the Church, to wit by ſtanding at the Goſpell, by puting of their bonet to adore the Euchariſt and ſuch like, are done in the Latine Church in Latin, and it is ſufficient that the clearke anſers for the people, for it is thus more readilie performed then in the vulgar tõgue.* Lyr. ini. Cor. 14.

Inde etiam inoleuit vſus vel laudabilis cõſuetudo in Eccleſia vt pronũtiato literaliter Euãgelio ſtatim in vulgari, populo exponeretur. Belet. in Proœ. Exp. diuinorum offic.

Which wordes are ſo plaine againſt Sir Humfrey in diuers reſpects that he may be ashamed to heare them. Belethus cited out of Caſſander to proue that ſeruice and prayer muſt be in the vulgar language, is abuſed by them both. For Belethus expreſſelie ſuppoſeth that the Maſſe and office of the Preiſt are in Latine, and therefore euen in this ſame place and euen in ſome of the wordes cited by Caſſander he mentioneth a lau-

laudable cuſtome of ſome places an which, ſayth he, the Goſpell being pronounced, it is preſentlie expounded in the vulgar tongue. Now if it were read in the Maſſe by the Preiſt in the vulgar tongue, then it had beene vaine for Belethus yea and impertinent to haue made mention of that cuſtome in the entrance of his worke of expounding the diuine offices for the vſe of the leſſe learned ſorte of the Clergie as he profeſſeth to vndertake. It is true he hath in the ſame paſſage that it was prohibited to ſpeake with tongues without an interpreter, but that is nothing els but the very ſame which the Apoſtle himſelfe declared 1. Cor. 14. vnderſtanding by tongues the miraculous ſpeech of ſtrange languages which the ſpeakers themſelues did not vnderſtand, aboute which ſaith this author there was in the Primatiue Church a prohibition except it were with an interpreter. And this is that which by accomodation Belethus applyes to the argument of his booke by way of Prologue.

In the rehearſall of D. Hardings wordes Sir Humfrey takes onelie thoſe which teſtifie that in the Primatiue Church prayers were in the vulgar language. But he leaues out the iuſte reaſons which the Doctor alledges for the alteration of the ſame made by the authoritie of the Church euen with in the firſt foure hundreth yeares: as alſo he omits thoſe pregnant

proofes

prooſes which he brings to showe that ſix hundreth yeares after Chriſt the ſeruice of the Church was in no other language then in Greeke or Latine: By all which the reader may perceiue this author is not ſincerelie dealt with in this paſſage, that which yet will more plainelie appeare if he will pleaſe to ſee his anſer to Iewels chalenge the 3. article.

The teſtimonie of Waldenſis is vſed by Caſſander onely to proue that diuine ſeruice or Maſſe ought to be pronounced with an intelligible voyce that the people may anſer; Amen, but not to proue that the publike office muſt be in vulgar language, and ſo it is impertinent.

Honorius cited by Sir Humfrey page 193. is falſified in regarde he is alledged for the cauſe of the alteration of the ancient cuſtome of the vſe of ſeruice in a knowne tongue. For that author ſpeakes not a word of the vulgar language but onely of the ſecret pronoūcing of the Canon which was decreed, ſaith he, (I knowe not howe truely) by occaſion of a ſtrange accident which happend in times paſt touching that matter. *Vnde ſinodali decreto ſub anathemate eſt præceptum vt nullus Canonem, niſi in libro & in ſacris veſtibus, & ſuper altare, & ſuper ſacrificium legat.* In which words I knowe not what linx except our Egleeyd Humfrey can ſee ſeruice in the vulgar tongue.

Gretzer

Gretzer is abused both in sense and wordes. In sense because he speakes onely of the Latin tongue and of that time when it was either vulgar or very common to manie nations: and yet the knight applyes his speech to proue that publike seruice ought to be deliuered in the vulgarly knowne tongue of euerie nation and at all times, not contenting himselfe with lesse then this. In wordes he doth also abuse Gretzerus, for that he cites them neither intirely nor consequenter in English, omitting or at the least altering those which haue relation to the authors precedent sentence, to wit: *hinc illæ exhortationes &c.* hence are those exhortations of the Fathers &c. and also others before them which he ought to haue rehearsed compleatly because they are to the same purpose. I will put the whole tenour of his wordes in the margen that the reader may more plainely see the fraude: and how repugnant Gretzerus is to Sir Humfreys tenet in this particular as professedly he must of necessitie be, as being a professed defender of Bellarmins doctrine in matters of Controuersie. But now because I haue already treated in part of this before, and breifly giuen sentence already of that which Sir Humfrey produceth for the defense of his doctrine, I will include the contents of this whole paragraph in the same censure, and so passe along to the next which is of the worship of images, where

Latini Patres quos citat. (Whitakerus) loquuntur De eo tempore quo lingua Latina erat multis gentibus vulgaris, aut valde communis, hinc omnes simul psallebant & Missæ linguæ populo nota celebatur quia Latina lingua erat omnibus vel plerisque nota. Hincillæ Patrũ exhortationes vt omnes simul psallant, vtque faciant attente & intelligibili-

ter vocẽque ſuam cum Sacerdotum vocibus coniungant. Quæ admonitiones iuſtiſsimæ erant quãdoquidem lingua auditoribus non ignoſa omnia peragebãtur, & cõſuetudo ita ferebat vt tota eccleſia ſimul pſalleret. Nũc alia eſt ratio antiquato vulgari linguæ Latinæ vſu, quam linguã propter intermiſſum communẽ vſum, ex Eccleſia diuiniſque

where we are to examine whether the knight bringeth any ſounder matter then he hath donne heere, where (as I ſhould haue noted before) he falſely relateth a hiſtorie of certaine shepheardes out of his falſe frend Caſſander, which shepherds he affirmeth according to his emendicated relation, to haue tranſubſtantiated bread and wine into the body and bloud of Chriſt by pronuntiation of the words of conſecration which they had learned; whereas indeed the authenticall hiſtorie of that ſtrange accident written by Sophronius, ſaith onely that the bread and wine were ſuddenly burnt by fire from heauen and the shepheards ſtruken ſpeachleſſe for a time. But this howſoeuer it happened, being it can ſerue Sir Humfrey for no greater purpoſe then to replenish his pages, I leaue it to the reader to conſider of this his proceeding as he pleaſeth.

Preſently in the entrance of the 7. Paragraph Sir Hũfrey pronoũceth a very sharpe ſentence againſt the Coũcell of Trent for decreeing that due honour and veneration is to be giuen to the images of Chriſt and his Saintes, condemning it for a wicked and blaſphemous opinion. Loe heere the ſentence of condemnation, which is to be iudged ſo much the more rash and temerarious in reſpect the peremptorie Iudge leaueth out the greater part of the doctrine he cenſureth, which if he had added at

large as it ſtandeth in the Councell it would ſufficiently haue iuſtified it ſelfe: and becauſe Sir Humfrey for reaſons of ſtate would not take ſo much paines, I will doe it for him.

The Councell therefore in the 25. Seſſ. page 202. decreeth in this manner, The images of Chriſt the Virgin the Mother of God and other Saintes are cheifly in Churches to be had and retained, and due honour and veneration is to be giuen vnto them, not that it is beleiued there is in them any diuinity or virtue for which they are to be worshipped, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or that confidence is to be put in them, as in times paſt the Gentiles did who put their truſt in Idols, but becauſe the honour which is exhibited vnto images is referred vnto the Prototipes which they repreſent, ſo that by the images which we ſalute, and before which we vncouer our heads and kneele, we adore Chriſt and reuerence the Sainctes whoſe ſimilitude they haue, that which by the decrees of councels eſpecially of the ſecond Nicene Synod hath binne eſtabliſhed againſt the oppugners of images, thus the decree of the Councell of Trent; in which we finde not one word either wicked or blaſphemous, nay rather euery word ſoundeth nothing but piety and religion towards Chriſt and his Sainctes, whom it will haue honoured not only in themſelues but alſo in and by their images, which

officijs minime conueniebat exturbari, inque locũ eius vulgares & vernaculas ſubſtitui. Multa etiam dicta Patrum &c. Gretzerus] defenſ. lib. 2. c. 16.

which manner of honour as it is declared by the Councell is not onely not contrary to scriptures as Sir Humfrey falsely affirmeth, but also very conformable to them, both in regard the scriptures make mention of honour due vnto materiall things for the relation of representation which they haue to God or other his holie creatures: as also for that we vse no other reuerence to images thē the Church doth teach vs, whose authority the same scripture commendeth and commandeth vs to follow and obey, & more then this the Coūcel is so farre frō attributing to images anie vnlawfull manner of honour, that it doth not once vse either the worde worship, or adore, except where it speaketh of Christ himselfe: which wordes neuertheless if they be taken in the sense in which diuines doe commonlie take them, include no offence at all, as signifying an exteriour action of honour indifferent euen according to the phrase of scripture both to God and creatures, and being distinguished onelie according to the diuersitie of the internall affection, and submission of the minde, which submission and affection in the honouring of an inanimate creature, as an image is, is neuer by the worshipper exhibited to the image it selfe, but onelie to the thing it representeth: nay *nor yet* the exteriour signe of adoration as genuflectiō, or inclination of the bodie, *is giuen* to the image itselfe

Psal. 95.
Matth 5.

itſelfe for itſelfe and to remaine in it, but rather by the image which we ſalute, or before which wee proſtrate our ſelues, the ſame ſigne of honour is transferred ioyntelie with the affection of the mynde to the thing which is adored. Which doctrine is both ſo cleare in itſelfe and ſo plainelie declared by the Councell expreſlie teaching that the honour exhibited vnto thē is referred to the Paterne, that a verie child may conceiue it to be free from all ſuperſtitious worship and adoration, in ſo much that it is but groſſe ignorance, malice, and madneſſe in our aduerſaries to exclaime againſt the Romaniſts as idolaters for the honour they giue to images. And I would faine knowe of Sir Humfrey or anie other of his reformed companions in what place of ſcripture this propoſition. The images of Chriſt and his ſaints are to be duelie honoured: is condemned for wicked & blaſphemous? and the ſame I ſay of the auncient Fathers. And if they cannot produce as much as one onelie place either out of ſcripture or Fathers which doth truelie ſerue to that purpoſe, I meane which doth truelie condemne the foreſaid propoſition in that manner, as I knowe neither they nor the knight can performe, let him confeſſe that is cenſure of the Romaniſts is temerarious and falſe, and nothing els but a renouation of an old Iewish complainte againſt the Chriſtians of more auncient ages.

Cōc. Trid. Seſſ. 25. decret. de imag.

It is true I knowe the reformers vſe commonlie to alledge for their denyall of honor to images both ſcripture and Fathers as alſo Sir Humfrey doth in this paragraffe, and particularlie they vſe to produce the wordes of that which they call the ſecond cammaundement, to wit, thou ſhall not make to thy ſelfe anie grauen image. But touching this I haue showed *aboue* that according to the doctrine of S. Auguſtin there is no ſuch ſecond commaundement, thoſe wordes being onelie a parte of the firſt. Secondlie, howſoeuer the matter ſtands, certaine it is that except the ſectaries will turne Iewes or Turkes they ought not to take thoſe wordes in that rigorous ſenſe which they doe, for ſo by conſequence if they tye themſelues ſo ſtrictlie to the letter of the text, they muſt doe the ſame in the commaundement of the Sabaoth and ſo they will be come Sabatizing Iewes indeed. Wherefore except Sir Hnmfrey will turne plaine Talmudiſt, he can proue nothing againſt Chriſtians out of the foreſayd wordes.

In the 4. Period.

Now touching authorities of auncient Fathers he confeſſeth that heefor beareth to cite anie in particular, and what ſoeuer he falſelie pretendeth, the true reaſon was becauſe he founde none to cite except hee had produced ſuch places as they vſe onelie againſt the idolatrie of Gentils and Ethnikes as, Daniell Chamier

Chamier lib. 21. de imag.

mier and others of the reformed Doctours commonlie doe, which places neuer the lesse secluding their owne glosses vpon them doe not in anie sorte fauore their cause. And so Sir Hufrey insteede of Fathers hee cites Iewes and Gentils in whose doctrine touching this point, hee showeth himselfe to be more conuersant then in Christian writers as finding more for his purpose in them then in these, and therefore also as I imagin hee vseth no other answere to Bellarmin affirming that the making of images is not absolutelie prohibited by the lawe of God because God commaunded images to be made, the knight I say vseth no other anser then the anser of the Iewes, to wit that God did laye a generall commaunde vpon them, and not vpon himselfe: and so I say no more of it, but leaue to the reader to iudge howsolid and good such an ansere may be, and whether it sauoreth not much more of Iudaisme then of Christian religion.

True it is hee cites diuers authours which haue writ since the Councel of Francford, but some of thē as Agrippa, Erasmus, Cassander & Chemnitius, are of no authority with vs, others are suspected of corruptiō, I meane to haue ben corrupted by malignant publishers, as Polidor Virgil and Agobardus. Others are impertinētlie alledged in regarde they eyther speake onelie of the image of God himselfe as Philo

Iudeus and S. Auguſtin, or of the manner of worship not of the ſubſtance of the honor, as Pereſius Bellarmin. Wicelius, Hincmarus: for that they eyther onelie condemne the adoration of pictures takeing the word adoration for that kinde of honour which is due vnto God onelie, or els they ſpeake onelie of the priuate errous of ſome ſimple people: of which ſorte is Polidor & Biel when they reprehend the abuſes and ſuperſtitions of ſome ſimple people, who out of ignorance giue more honour to images then eyther they ought to doe or the Church alloweth, yet doth Polidor expreſſelie approue of due honour of the ſame as his owne wordes declare euen in thoſe places where he vſeth that reprehenſion: for thus he ſaith after he had made relation of diuers images of Chriſt and his Apoſtles mentioned by Euſebius and others euen in the moſt primatiue yeares of the Church. *Hence therefore grewe the vſe of putting in Churches and honoring as well the ſtatues of our Sauiour, as his Saincts.* And he adds *Ecquis igitur tam diſſolutus tamque audacia præditus eſt qui velit poſſit ne dubitare ſeu aliter ſomniare ne dicam ſentire vel cogitare de imaginum cultu ac demum ſit tot longe Sanctiſſimorum Patrum decreto conſtitutum.*

Hinc igitur natum vt merito tam ipſi Saluatori quã eius diuis ſtatuas in templis poni & venerationi haberi conſueuerit. Polid lib. 6. cap. 5.

By which wordes it is manifeſtly conuinced that is other wordes razed by order of the Index haue either beene foiſted in by the new ſectaries

ſectaries, to wit thoſe which auerre that till the time of S. Hierome all the auncient Fathers reiected worship of images for feare of idolatrie; or els he meanes onelie that they durſt not practice the ſame leaſt their action might ſeeme idolatrous either to the ignorant Gentils, or to ſuch as were then latelie conuerted from Gentiliſme and as yet but infirme in faith, and eaſilie ſcandalized in this nature. All which neuertheleſſe cannot poſſible preiudice the doctrine and practice of the Church it ſelfe in generall: So that neither anie of theſe authours ſeuerallie nor all of them together proue that abſolutelie to honore the images of Chriſt and his ſaints is wicked or blaſphemous, which is the aſſertion the knight here maintaines; and yet he is not aſhamed to call their teſtimonies the confeſſion of his aduerſaries, among which alſo that his impudencie might more clearelie appeare, he foyſteth in to that rancke Bellarmin and Vaſquez, which authours if the reader be not ouer groſſelie ignorant he will eaſilie perceiue, at the leaſt by the reſt of their workes, that they cannot truelie fauore Sir Humfreys tenets in this point of Controuerſie, they hauing both writ profeſſedly of it againſt the reformers doctrine and in defenſe of the practiſe of the Roman Church touching the vſe and honour of images.

And as for the Emperours Valens and Theo-

doſius whome he citeth out of Crinitus ſaying they made proclamation to all Chriſtians againſt the images of Chriſt. It is falſe that thoſe two Emperours euer published anie decree againſt the images of Chriſt, but expreſſelie in honour of of the ſame by eſtabliſhing by lawe that the image of the Croſſe of Chriſt should not be framed vpon the ground, as vpon the ſtones of ſepulchers or graues where it might eaſilie be prophaned by the feet of thoſe that paſſed ouer them, and that this is the trueth of that paſſage of thoſe two Emperours, or at the leaſt of Theodoſius, Crinitus his verie wordes would haue plainelie declared if they had not shrunke in the wetting I meane if they had ben intirelie related by the knight who is not the firſt that hath corrupted the tenour of Theodoſius his lawe by leauing out the worde, *humi*, vpon the grounde for the wordes of the foreſaid lawe being thes, *let not the Croſſe of Chriſt be painted vpon the grounde*, or ſome ſuch like, by leauing out the wordes, *vpon the grounde*, the ſenſe as you ſee cometh to be quite contrarie, that is the ſenſe falleth out to be this, let not the Croſſe of Chriſt be painted, which trick of the ſectaries was diſcouered long ſince by Alanus Copus in his 4. Dialogue the 11. chap. to their vtter shame and diſcredit. And yet beſides this, I maruell greatelie that either Sir Humfrey or

his

his predeceſſours offer to make vſe of the foreſaid wordes of the lawe which as they are cited by him are ſo generall that they quite cõdemne the practice of the reformed brothers themſelues, none or verie few of them being as yet mounted to that degree of puritie as expreſſelie to proclame a generall lawe againſt the pictures of Chriſt as not to be painted or grauen at all, and ſo I conclude that either thoſe wordes of the two Emperours are to be read as the Romaniſts doe vſe to read them, and then they plainelie prooue the reuerence of the Croſſe to haue beene practized in auncient times: or if they be to be read ſo generallie as the ſectaries will haue them, then if they proue anie thing, they doe no leſſe then reproue euen the Puritans themſelues and their practice in that particular.

To the teſtimonie of Tertullian whom alſo ſo the knight produceth l. de idolat. c. 5. ſaying, *Thou haſt his law make thou no image.* And preſẽtlie after, *make no image againſt the law vnleſſe God commaunde the as he did moyſes:* I anſwere firſt that if it be againſt the lawe to make anie image at all, then be theſe wordes of Tertullian as much againſt the reformers as the Romaniſts. For both the Church of England and all the Lutheran Churches at the leaſt, make both the images of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. And I know a famous Puritan I meane

a pure Caluiniſt (whoſe name is Daniell Chamier) who expreſſelie defendes that images are not abſolutelie prohibited by that precept which he calleth the ſecond commaundement, but onelie to the end to honore them religiouſlie. So that the wordes of Tertullian muſt of neceſſity be either otherwiſe tempered then they be by Sir Humfrey, or they will fall vpon his owne Church, as well as vpon the Roman Church.

Chamier lib. 2. de imag.

Wherefore I anſwere ſecondlie that *Tertullian* ſpeakes onelie againſt idolatrous images, or Idols, as the verie argument of his booke doth shewe, which is intituled againſt idolatrie not againſt Chriſtian images, as is manifeſtlie conuinced out of an other worke of his, in which he maketh expreſſe mention of the picture of Chriſt himſelfe grauen in the chalices of his time, which he alſo mētioneth as a thing frequentlie practized: ſo that vnleſſe Sir Humfrey will ſay that Tertullian plainelie contradicted himſelfe, he cannot poſſiblie be imagined to haue ſpoaken againſt the images of Chriſt and his ſaincts, but onelie againſt ſuch as the Gentils in his time, or the Iewes made in time of the old Teſtament contrary to the lawe of God as being repreſentations of falſe and fained gods and godiſſes as is owne wordes in his booke aboue cited plainelie teſtifie, where thus he diſcourſeth againſt the Chriſtian ma-

De Pudicitia.

kers

kers, of Idols. *Potes vnum Deum prædicare qui rantos efficis?* Canest thou preach one God who makest so manie? *Tota die ad hanc partem zelus fidei perorabit ingemens Christianum ab idolis in Ecclesiam venire, de aduersaria officina in domum Dei. The zeale of faith will plead all the day long on this side lamenting a Christian to come from idols into the Church, from the aduerse officine in to the house of God.* And alittle after: *to reach those handes to the bodie of our Lord, which giue bodies to deuils.*

Eas manus admouere corpori Domini quæ dæmonijs corpora conferũt.

The same I say of Origẽ cited out of Cassãder by Sir Hũfrey, whome they both abuse in that they vse his testimonie against the veneration of images in the primatiue Church. For I haue diligently read his 7. booke cited by thẽ wher I finde him to speake much against idols but nothing against Christian images his wordes are these. *Illarum enim gentium nemo ab his alienus est quod vereatur numen ob viles has ceremonias detrahere quæ versantur circa aras & materias effigiatas varijs imaginibus, nec quod intelligat dæmonas inhærere certis locis & statuis siue incantatos quibusdam magicis carminibus siue alios incubantes locis semel præoccupatis vbi lurconum more se oblectant victimarum nidoribus voluptatem captantes nefariam & vetitã diuinis atque naturæ legibus. Cæterum Christiani homines & Iudæi sibi temperant ab his propter illud legis: Dominum Deum tuum timebis & ipsi soli seruices. Et*

propter

propter illud non erunt tibi dij alieni præter me, & non facies tibi ſimulachrum nec vllam effigiem &c. Non adorabis ea neque ſeruies illis. *Aliaque multa his ſimilia quæ adeo nos prohibent ab aris & ſimulachris vt etiam emori iubeant citiùs quam cotaminemus noſtrã de Deo fidem talibus impietatibus.* Et poſtea. *Liquet enim hæc dedicari ab hominibus falſam de Deo opinionem habentibus.* For none of thoſe nationes is free from theſe things becauſe they feare to dishonore the diuine power in reſpect of thes vile ceremonies which are vſed before the altars, and tables carued with diuers images: For that they neyther vnderſtand that deuils inhabit in certaine places, and ſtatues either inchaunted by certaine magicall verſes, or others lying in places once preoccupated, where they delite themſelues like gulliguts with the ſauore of the ſacrifices, taking nefarious delyte prohibited both by diuine lawes, and the lawes of nature. But Chriſtians and Iewes temper themſelues from theſe for that of the lawe: Thou shalt feare thy lord God, and shalt ſerue him alone. And for that. Thou shalt not haue ſtrange Gods beſides mee. And. Thou shalt not make to thy ſelfe anie ſemblance, or anie likenes &c. Thou shalt not adore them nor ſerue thẽ. them, and manie other things like to theſe which ſo debarre vs from altars, & likeneſſes, that they commaunde vs ſooner to dye them to contaminate our faith of God with ſuch impieties. And afterwardes he addes. It is cleare that theſe things are dedicated by men which haue a falſe opinion of God

&c. Thus origen aboute the end. By whose owne wordes the reader may euidentlie perceiue, he discourseth onelie against the images and altars of false Gods. Which authors wordes I did therefore so largely relate that he himselfe might demonstrate howe much he is abused both by Cassander and Sir Humfrey touching this matter. And indeed I haue often times much wondered to see the great stupiditie of the sectaries in this point, and especiallie the most learned sorte of them, in they be either so fotishlie ignorant or so Iewishlie superstitious and blind, that they are not able to distinguish betweene the honour which Christians giue to the picture of Christ true God and man, and the worship which the Gentils giue to the images of their imaginarie and counterfeit Gods. Not ceasing either in their sermons or ordinarie discourses to compare most grosselie the one with the other, and to prononnce sentence of idolatrie against them both a like, and applying most absurdelie vnto the condemnation of the reuerence which the Romanists vsuallie practise towardes the foresaid images of Christ and his saincts those same sentences of scripture and Fathers which by them were onelie spoken against the pernicious errour of the Pagans, whereas in truth there is as much distance betwixt the one and the other as there is betwene Heauen and earth,

earth, God and the deuill, Christ and Belial, the person represented by the picture of Christ being both capable and worthie of honour, but the persons represented by the images of the false gods being neither capable nor worthie of worship as being either wicked men or plaine deuills. And moreouer, the honour exhibited to the picture of Christ being not giuen to the picture for the picture or by the picture itselfe I meane nor without relation to the Prototipe, nor yet in the picture permanentlie, but rather to the Prototipe in and by meanes of the picture or by the picture transitorilie: not much vnlike to an arowe or darte which altho' it passeth by the ayre and in the ayre, yet doth it not stay there but in the marke onelie: whereas one the contrarie the Gentils went grosselie to worke, for the honour which they gaue to the statues and figures of their Gods the same they gaue to the images themselues by themselues and for themselues attributing diuinitie, or at the least diuine operations vnto them, and adoring them with actions of honour proper to the true God alone as sacrifices, and the like, all which is so farre different not onely from the practice, but also from the cogitations of anie Christian man, that it can be esteemed no lesse then most grosse ignorance in the reformers to bring it in question.

And

And altho' it is true that the leight of nature onely is not ſufficient to eſtablish the honour of images which the Councell of Trent decreed as the knight doth captiouſly inferre out of the wordes of a moderne diuine whom he citeth: neuertheleſſe the leight of nature doth ſufficiently teach vs the difference betweene true and idolatrous worship of images, and doth alſo plainely dictate vnto vs that thoſe are both ignorantly blinde who are not able to conceiue it, and temerarious and rash who not being able to conceiue it, condemne it as contrary to the lawe of God, our as ſectarie commōly doe. And thus much for the anſwere to the teſtimonie of Tertullian and to shewe that antiquity is neither for the reformers nor againſt the Romaniſts in this matter, as the knight doeth vanely indeuour to prooue, but expreſſely for them in regard that as I haue shewed out of the ſame authour euen in thoſe moſt pure and primatiue times therwas vſe of the picture of Chriſt, yea and of a grauen image (which is that the reformers moſt directly impugne and exclaime againſt) and that euen in the chalices where of neceſſitie it muſt needs haue beene honoured, the ſame authour further affirming that the foreſaid image was much vſed in his time being the *ſecond* hundreth yeare after Chriſt our Sauiour when idolatrie was not yet extinguished, which is an argument

gument cõuincing that it was not a thing then first inuented but long before eſtabliſhed, nor offenſiue to the moſt ſincere and intire Chriſtians of thoſe prime ages as nowe it is to the Nyce noueliſts of our dayes, many of which are ſo ſuperſtitiouſly preciſe that, as an honeſt Proteſtant writer affirmeth, they had rather ſee Antichriſt then the picture of Chriſt in the Church Windoe. And now let this ſuffice for a breefe Scantlin of the antiquitie of the reuerent vſe of images to omit others, as S. Auguſtin who in his booke of the Trinity calleth images religious ſignes. And S. Gregory who ſpeaketh of proſtration before thē which is one of the greateſt actions of honour that the Romaniſts vſe to exhibit towarde any image. So that by this the reader may plainely ſee the Romaniſts want neither antiquity nor vniuerſalitie for their doctrine in this point as contrariwiſe the miſreformers want them both, for their pure negation of the ſame.

Sir. Th. Ouerb. Caract. of a Preciſ.

Lib. 3 cap. Greg. l. 7. epiſt. 53.

And if they demaunde ſcriptures of vs beſides that which I alledged before, we may truely anſwere them as a graue diuine in the ſeuenth Synod anſwered the heretikes of that time. If they aske vs (ſaith he) in what place of ſcripture we read that the picture of Chriſt is to be honoured, we anſwere that there where we read that Chriſt himſelfe is to be honoured.

And

And if nowe the reformers demaunde of vs what reaſon we haue for the honour of the images of Chriſt and his Saincts: we may anſwer them that we haue the ſame reaſon that they haue to honore the image of their King or his deareſt fauorits. For as in ciuill honour, to reſpect or honor ethe Kings picture, doth not diminish the honour due vnto the King himſelfe, but increaſeth it ſo it paſſeth in the worship of the image of Chriſt, and if the Puritans deny this, there we leaue them as guiltie of treaſon againſt God and man.

And now here before I conclude I muſt of neceſſitie aduertice the reader of ſuch abuſes as Sir Humfrey hath committed in his citations of ſome of the authours he produceth in this place. Wherefore in the firſt place I put the two councells he alledgeth as being as I ſuppoſe of greateſt authoritie in our aduerſaries conceipte. The one is the Councell of Francford which becauſe it is corruptedlie rehearſed by Chemintius, we may iuſtelie diſclame from it, if ther were no other reaſon. Yet Sir Humfrey knowes beſides this that the Romaniſts hould that councell for illegitimate. As for the Councell of Eliberis, it is not abſolutelie reiected by Romaniſts, yet they knowe it was but Prouinciall conſiſting of 19. Bishops which whatſoeuer they defined in this matter which as yet is vncertaine, yet could it not be anie

Ge-

Generall doctrine or practise for the vniuersall Church, but at the most for their owne whole Countrye as the circunstances of that time, and place required. But of what authoritie soeuer they were, neither of those two councels condemned the adoration of images as it is vnderstanded and vsed in the Roman Church, for vnlawfull and much lesse for wicked and blasphemous as the knight here contendes: but if they truely condemned anie worship of images, it was onelie diuine not honorarie worship they condemned, and so they neither of them preiudicate the antiquitie and vniuersalitie of the Roman doctrine in this point, and much lesse doe they establish the antiquitie or vniuersalitie of the misreformed Churches, which for the most parte will not suffer anie images either painted or vnpainted to appeare in their sinagoge, either vpon walles or windowes. And yet besides this, it is well knowne the Councell of Nyce as consisting both of Latin and Grecian Fathers, was much more generall then either the Francfordian or Eliberitan Sinod; and in the Nycene it is certaine that the honor of Images was defended, and established, as our aduersarie not vnwillinglie confesse, and the decrees of it plainelie testifie; wher as in the other two it remaines doubtfull and ambiguous euen till this day what was truely deliuered in them

tou-

touching this point, ther being onelie some certaine fragments of them extant touching this matter: out of all which incertaintieit is plaine that no assured antiquitie or vniuersalitie can be extracted for Sir Humfrey's cause.

In the citation of Clemangis he takes onely that which seemed most for his purpose, and in cauninglie left out that which makes against him: for also that author affirmes that the vniuersall Church induced by iust occasion did decree in the Primatiue Church that no Images should be placed in Churches in regarde of those who were cõuerted from Gentilisme to Christian faith (which how true or false it is importeth not much for the present dispute) yet the same Clemangis presently after affirmes also that the same Church did alter that lawe and ordaine that Images should be vsed in Churches for the instruction of the vulgar sorte and for memorie of Christ and his saints, and yet further adding that he brings this but for an example to showe that this being but an Ecclesiasticall lawe it may be changed at the Churches pleasure: so that if Sir Humfrey had cited this author home, he could haue founde nothing to proue his position to wit that the doctrine of Image-honor is a blasphemous opinion, but rather the contrarie is expressed sufficiently by Clemangis, for that to set Images in a holie place that is in the temple

Postquam vero satis in fide (Christiani) imbuti, satis cõfirmati fuerunt, salubberrima rursus ratione visũ est illud statutum debere aboleri, & per generalẽ decretũ est Synodũ imagines atq; picturas in Ecclesijs fieri, quæ à laicis & simplicibus pro libris haberẽtur. Clemang. de nouis celeber. non inst.

of God, as he expreſſely affirmes the ſame Church did for moſt holeſome reaſones, is one of the greateſt acts of honour that the Romaniſts exhibite vnto them. And by this we ſe that our aduerſarie hath neither dealt ſincerelie in the alledging of this author, nor in the rehearſall of his wordes in which he paſſeth in ſilence the cheefe parte of them viz: thoſe in which he shewes that prohibition of the primitiue Church which he mentiones touching the placing of pictures in Churches, to haue beene onely an Eccleſiaſticall precept and changeable, yea and de facto changed by a generall Councell, as his wordes related in the margen declare. That which Caſſander alſo doth plainely inſinuate when in his conſultation of the vſe of images, he ſaith (tho falſely) the Fathers in the beginning of the Church did abhorre all veneration of images: yet afterwardes in the ſame treatiſe, he graũtes conuenient, and due honor, vnto them as in another place I will shewe by relation of his owne formall wordes. So now this being all which I need to ſpeake of this matter ſeeing that by this I haue ſaide it will manifeſtly appeare that Sir Humfrey hath fayled both in the authenticall proofe of the antiquitie, or vniuerſalitie of his owne poſition touching the vſe of images, and in the diſproofe of ours, I paſſe

paſſe to the next paragraph in the which doctrine of Indulgences vſed in the Roman Church is impugned by him moſt couragiouſly by virtue of an old chalenge made in Martin Luthers dayes but as yet neuer performed, therefore let vs ſee howe our newe Champion Sir Humfrey vſeth his armes.

Firſt he relates the decree of the Tridentine Councell Seſſ. 25. yet in a ſome thing different manner then it runneth there. But the true tenour of it is this in ſubſtance: that whereas by Chriſt the power of Indulgẽces was graũted to the Church & that shee hath vſed that power deliuered vnto her by diuine ordinance euen in the moſt auncient times, the ſacred Synod doth teach and commaunde that the vſe of them as verie profitable to Chriſtian people, & approued by the authoritie of ſacred Councells ought to be retayned, and doth condemne thoſe with a curſe who either affirme them to be vnlawfull, or denie that there is in the Church authoritie to graunt them: this is the true tenour of the decree which Sir Humfrey hath not ſo ſincerelie rehearſed as he ought to haue done, which whether he did it to aduantage his cauſe or onelie out of an ill cuſtome he hath gotte by his frequent exerciſe of ſuch trickes in diuers places of his booke, I knowe not; onelie of this I ame ſure, that he produceth nothing of anie force for the im-

pugnation of it in all his paragtaffe, notwithstanding he bouldlie auerreth that it will be founde (I knowe not where) that neither Christ nor the primatiue Fathers euer knew, much lesse euer exercised such pardons as are nowe daylie practized in the Church of Rome. this he affirmeth most stronglie, but proueth his affirmation so weakely that its hard to iudge whether his temeritie in affirming, or his defectiuenesse in prouing that which he affirmeth, be more excessiue, how be it most certaine it is that neither the one nor the other can be iustified, for that if he had vsed the least circumspection in the world, he might haue founde not onelie in Bellarmin, and other diuines but also in the Councell of Trent which he citeth, mention both of scripture & Fathers copiouslie cited & quoted for the proofe both of the power and vse of Indulgences in the Church from time to time, of which as it seemes he durst not take anie notice, but passed it ouer in silence, to the ende his greate wordes which he vttered in the beginning might carie a fairer colour of trueth, which other wise would presentlie haue discouered themselues to be false.

True it is he describeth one kinde of mitigation or relaxation of punishment imposed vpon offenders for denyall of their faith, or sacrificing to idols, which he graunteth to haue

beene

beene called by the name of pardon or Indulgence, and to haue beene deriued from ſainct Paule who releaſed the inceſtuous Corinthian from the bonde of excomunication, all which tho' it be true in itſelfe, yet is it but an euaſion which he vſeth to the end he may with greater colour reiect thoſe pardons which are truelie and properlie Indulgences that is a relaxation from a temporall punishment due vnto a penitent ſinner according to Gods iuſtice for ſatisfaction of the paine of his offenſes alreadie remitted touching the guilt and eternall punishment of the ſame, by vertue of the keyes, that is by the power of bynding and looſing ſinnes which Chriſt gaue to his Church, and in her particularlie to the cheefe viſible paſtour thereof. Of the power and practize of which Kynde of pardon, if Sir Humfrey had not beene diſpoſed to cogge, he might haue found good ſtore of teſtimonies both out of ſcriptures, Councells, and Fathers alledged for the ſame by Roman diuines.

And as for ſcriptures there are two places eſpeciallie which doe plainelie enuffe conuince the foreſaid truth of Indulgences if they be reight vnderſtanded according to the interpretation of the auncient Fathers. The one is that generall ſentence of our Sauiour Math. 18. in which he giueth an illimitated power to his Apoſtles and in them to their lawfull ſucceſ-

fours for binding and looſing without anie reſtriction either to this or that one matter, or to this or that manner of remiſſion, and conſequentlie in that moſt generall power is included the authoritie of remitting the temporall punishment due to ſinnes which is that we call the power of Indulgences of which generall power graunted to Preiſts we haue diuers teſtimonies of Fathers and particularlie of S. Aug. who vpon thoſe wordes *& iudicium datum eſt* Apoc. 20. Sayth: *Non hoc putandum eſt de vltimo Iudicio dici, ſed ſedes Præpoſitorum eſt, & ipſi Præpoſiti intelligendi ſunt per quos Eccleſia nunc gubernatur, Iudicium autem datum nullum melius accipiendum videtur quam id qnod dictum eſt: quæ ligaueritis in terra ligata erunt & in Cælo: & quæ ſolueritis in terra ſoluta erunt & in Cælo.* The like he hath vpon the Goſp. of S. Ioh. *Ideo cum proceſsiſſet mortuus adhuc ligatus, confitens & adhuc reus vt ſoluerentur peccata eius miniſtris hoc dixit Dominus, ſoluite illum & ſinite abire quid eſt ſoluite & ſinite abire. Quæ ſolueritis in terra ſoluta ſunt in cælis.* S. Ambroſe alſo ſpeaking of the ſame power l. 1. de Pœnit. c. 2. ſaith: *Deus diſtinctionem non facit qui miſericordiam ſuam promiſit omnibus, & relaxandi licentiam Sacerdotibus ſuis ſine vlla exceptione conceſſit.* God, ſaith S. Ambroſe, makes no diſtinction, who promiſed his mercie to all, & gaue to his Preists licence to releaſe without anie exception. Neyther can anie reaſon be aſſigned why the paſtours of the

Aug. lib. 2. de Ciuit. c. 9. idem: tract. 49. in Ioan. vid. tract. 22.

Vide etiã Hil. can. 18 math. & Hier. in cap. 18. Math.

Church should haue power to applie the merits of the passion of Christ for remission of the guilt of the sinnes themselues with the eternall paine and yet not haue power to applie the same for the remission of the temporall punishment as due vnto them, after the remission according to the order of Gods iustice, as the eternall punishment was due before it, especiallie considering that the temporall paine as being farre inferiour in nature and qualitie to the sinne itselfe, it requires much lesse power and fewer conditions for its remission then doth the guilt of the sinne and eternall paine to the guilt annexed.

The other place of scripture is not onelie for the proofe of the power to graunt Indulgences, but also of the practice of the same by S. Paule himselfe the 2. chapter of the second epistle to the Corinth. where speaking to the same Corinthians, he sayth of himselfe: *And whome you haue pardoned anie thing, I also. For, my selfe also that which I pardoned, if I pardoned anie thing, for you in the person of Christ that we be not circumuented of Satan.* Which wordes altho' they be obscure in the Gramaticall construction, yet doe they sufficientlie declare those partes and conditions which are found in such Indulgences as are now practiced in the Roman Church that is to say power in the collator or giuer, pietie in the cause, and grace in

the receiuer. S. Paule sheweth his authoritie in that he affirmeth he gaue perdon to the incestuous Corinthian in the person of Christ that is by authoritie from him receiued: he sheweth the cause to haue beene the common profit of the Corinthians themselues, to wit, least they should be circumuented by the deuill so that they in the like occasion might fall in to desperation by ouer much rigour as the incestuous man might haue done if he had not beene pardoned in the performance of some parte of the punishment due to his offense. Lastelie he in the precedent wordes sheweth the receiuer to haue beene in the state of grace in that he signifieth his sorowe and pennance to haue beene so great that he was readie to haue beene swalowed vp by the excesse of it. And so by this we may perceiue howe deceitfullie Sir Humfrey proceedeth in his 220. page where he insinuateth that S. Paule in the place now cited did onelie release the incestuous Corinthian from the bonde of excomunication, whereas indeede the Apostle did not onelie that, but also did absolue him from that temporall punishment & affliction in which if he had pleased he might haue constreined him to continue longer, and so snpplyed by his authoritatiue and suffragatorie pardon that parte of satisfaction which otherwise remained to haue beene performed by the continuation of the punish-

ment

ment impoſed and due to the penitent according to the exaction of Gods iuſtice, he ſupplyed it I ſaie by application of the merits or ſatisfactions of Chriſt, which application alſo, and not onelie the authoritie by which ſainct Paule did it, is included in thoſe wordes, *in the perſon of Chriſt*. That which by the comentarie of Theodoret vpon this paſſage doth plainelie appeere who diſcreetlie noteth that ſaint Paul is ſaid here to pardone the inceſtuous Corinthians ſinne becauſe it was greater then his pennance. And S. Ambroſe lib. 2. de Pænit. cap. 2. ſpeaking of the ſame matter, ſaith of S. Paule: *Donauit Corintho peccatum per pœnitentiam*. And a little after: *Etenim qui de remittenda prædicauit pœnitentia, debuit & de iis qui iterandum putant Baptiſmum non ſilere*. By which teſtimonies of theſe two moſt famous and auncient authours Sir Humfreys euaſion ſaying that the Apoſtle did onelie free the inceſtuous Corinthian from the bond of Excommunication, doth euidentlie appeare to be falſe & friuolous. And thus weſee that not onelie the relaxation of a punishment enioyned, as the knight would haue it, but alſo the ſame or very like forme of pardon which the Romã Church vſeth at this preſent tyme, was practiced by S. Paule himſelfe in the forefayd caſe. Theod. in 2. Cor. 2.

And in trueth ſuppoſing at the leaſt certaine receiued maximes of diuinitie which might eaſily

easily be demõstrated by scriptures if the place did serue for it: to wit that after the guilt of sinne is remitted, some temporall punishment remaineth which according to the exigence of iustice must be remoueed before the soule can attaine to perfect blessednesse, either by iust indurance or mercifull remission: and more ouer that the same temporall affliction which many suffer in this life euen after their sinnes be intirelie remitted, is not for correction and commination onely (as the sectaries doe friuolouslie contend) as appeareth plainelie in the example of Dauid who altho' he knewe from the mouth of a Prophet that the guilt of his adultry was pardoned, yet vnderstanding neuertheless by the same Prophet that ther remained no smale punishment behinde to wit no lesse then the death of his deareſt child, and that as the scripture it selfe testifieth neither for correction nor commination onely, but because by his scandalous actiõ he had caused the enimies of God to blaspheme his name and as the text declareth in the 2. Booke of the Kings the 12. chapter, *propter verbum hoc* that is for this thy fact taking word for action as it is most frequently taken in the scriptures: and yet besides all this the same Dauid did voluntarie pennance composing the whole miserere Psalme and crying out with an *amplius laua* for a perpetuall testimony of the

same.

ſame. And now ſuppoſing as I ſay all this, the doctrine & practice of Indulgẽces now vſed by the cheefe Paſtours of the Roman Church is ſo well groũded that except onely in thoſe in whom obſtinacie reigneth more then reaſon, it admitteth no trergiuerſation in the credibilitie and faith of it. For as God is infinitly not onely iuſt but alſo mercifull in himſelfe by eſsẽce, ſo hath he cõmunicated to the gouernours of his church a kind of participatiue mixture of both thoſe attributes betweene which according to that of the pſalme *iuſtitia & pax oſculatæ ſunt*, he hath made a moſt louing league to the end that according to diuers cauſes and occaſions his ſpirituall officers may ſo vſe them in earth as the vſe may be approued in Heauen, ſometimes vſing rigour of diſcipline for the ſatisfaction of Gods iuſtice, other times lenity for the exerciſe of his mercy.

But now touching the confirmation of this doctrine by the authority of Fathers I will onely produce the teſtimonies of Tertull. and S. Cyprian who being both ſo ancient as they are knowne to be, they may iuſtely ſerue for ſufficient witneſſes of the aucient practice of the ſame in thoſe primatiue times.

Tertullian therefore in his booke to the Martirs and firſt chapter ſpeaketh of the remiſſion of the paine due to ſinnes which the Biſhops gaue vnto the ſinners either at the pe-

petition of martyrs, or for other cauſes, calling it by the name of peace. Which peace ſaith he ſome that haue it not in the Church are accuſtomed to aske it of the martyrs in priſion, and therefore you alſo (meaning the Bishops) ought for that cauſe to haue, norish, and keepe it in your ſelues to the end that if perhaps you may communicate it to others. where Tertullian by the worde peace vnderſtandes the Bishops abſolution at the leaſt frome ſome parte of the ſinners pennance by application of the ſuperabundant ſatisfactions of the martyrs which application is alſo in the worde peace included, as manifeſtly may be gathered out of the ſame Tertullian, who afterwardes falling in to hereſie in his 22. chap. of his booke of chaſtitie recalled that which he had tought before, to wit that indult could not be giuen to thoſe that had fallen, at the petition of the martyrs, becauſe ſaith he (now turned Heretike) there remaine no ſatisfactions of martyrs, (which ſatisfactions hee calleth *oleum faculæ*) which can ſuffice for themſelues & others. All which as the reader may clearelie perceiue is nothing els in ſubſtance but ſuch an Indulgence as is now practiced by the Bishops of Rome, of whome and others by their comiſſion, the foreſayd authour doth ſpeake in the place rehearſed.

And the ſame ſaith S. Cyprian in his laſt Ser-

Sermon *de lapsis* saith, *pœnitenti, operanti, rogãti, potest clementer ignoscere, potest in accepti̇um referre quicquid pro talibus & petierint martyres, & fecerint Sacerdotes*. To the working or laboring penitent (the Bishop of whome he speaketh as I suppose) may clemently pardon, & accept as receiued what soeuer the martyrs demaunde, & the Preists doe, or performe. And the like the same S. Cyp. hath l. 3. epist. 15. or 11.

I omit Sainct Gregorie whome yet both S. Thom. and Atisiodorus his predecessour testifie to haue graunted Indulgences in forme, which altho' it is not founde in his workes now extant, yet it is farre more credible, and certaine that those two authours would not haue vsed that testimonie with out infalible grounde that it was S. Gregories, then that it was feigned because kemnitius and other nouellists reiect it as suppositious. And if they will not admit of this testimonie because they see it not. At the least they must of necessitie admit of that which being yet more auncient is to be seene in the Chappell of S. Crosse of Hierusalem in Rome written in legible letters, that S. Siluester who was Bishop & pope aboue 1200. years paste did consecrate that Chappell and adorne it with maine reliquies of saints and indulted diuers perdons to the visiters of it. I could alsoe cite the Popes which since the time of S. Greg. in seuerall ages haue very fre-

frequentlie graunted Indulgences, but becauſe I knowe our preſumptuous aduerſaries contemne their authority (tho' iniuſtlie for that they haue ben of as great authoritie as their anticeſſours) I will ſaue the labour, and onely aduertice the reader that ther is farre greater reaſon for a prudent man to giue credit vnto them in the affirmatiue of this queſtion then there is to rely vpon the authoritie of the ſectaries for the negation, in regard that euen by their owne confeſſion the affirmatiue hath ben tought and practiced publikelie in the Chriſtian world at the leaſt for the ſpace of 400. years euen according to Kemnitius, who (tho' moſt falſely for that it may be proued That Leo the third who liued in the 8. or 9. hundreth yeare gaue pardons according to the manner of thoſe our times) affirmeth that Indulgences began aboute the yeare 1200. who neuerteleſſe on the contrary contradicting himſelfe graunteth that the firſt denyers of the ſame were the *Waldenſes*, a company of pore ignorant beggarlie fellowes. From whence we may inferre how impudentlie the kinght affirmeth antiquitie & vniuerſalitie in his owne Church for the denyall of Indulgences, yet dinying the ſame in the Church of Rome for her defence of them: ſuppoſing he could not produce as much as one authour either more or leſſe auncient for the negatiue

parte

parte liuing before the pore men of lions, who hauing no other saint for their founder then one Waldo a verie idiot, appeared aboute the yeare of our Lord 1170. that is manie hundreths of yeares after Indulgences had beene practized in the Christian world euen according to the forme now vsed. It is true Sir Humfrey alledgeth diuers Roman diuines as he vseth to doe, but it is but a meere shift he vseth to colour his position as being destitute of all other auncient authoritie & proofe. For I haue examined those authours & I finde there is not one of them which is not a zelous defender both of the power which Christ gaue vnto the Church to graunt Indulgences, & also of the lawfullnes & profit of them; nor doth anie one of them confesse the want of antiquitie & consent of the same: but some of them onelie confesse indeed there is no certainetie of their beginning, or when the vse of them came into the Church in the manner they are now vsed. To which purpose the testimonie cited out of B. Fisher may seeme to serue, who yet doth not say (*as the knight falselie relates*) that it is not sufficientlie manifest from whome Indulgences had their Originall, but he onelie sayth *non certo constare a quo primum tradi cæperunt, that it is not certainelie apparent who first began to giue them*. And altho' that author hath the rest of the wordes which Sir Hum-

Humfrey cites, yet hath he others in the ſame place which doe ſufficientlie declare his meaning in that manner of ſpeech; for he preſentlie addes that S. Gregorie is ſayde to haue graunted Indulgences, & they ſaye (ſaith he) *that there was ſome moſt auncient vſe of them among the Romans which the ſtations of the Citie, giue vs to vnderſtand*. And hence it is that the ſame Bishop in the ſame place turning his ſpeach to Luther his aduerſarie, ſayth vnto him, wherefore thou art a meere impoſter, or deceiuer of the people, not the Popes to whome (in this point of Indulgences) both the Goſpell fauoreth, and a generall Councell ſubſcribes, & alſo the vniuerſal companie of moderne interpreters vpon thoſe wordes of Chriſt math. 16. *what ſoeuer you ſhall bynde in earth ſhall be bounde in heauen, & what ſoeuer you ſhall looſe in earth ſhall be looſed in heaue. thus hee.* So that it is plaine that Bishop Fisher neuer duobted of the power of Indulgēces, or that the vſe of them is not lawfull or profitable, as neither doth he bring in queſtion whether the auncient Fathers & diuines did denie, or not acknowledge theſe particulars, but as I ſaide before, he onelie treates of the antiquitie of the vſe of the ſame, as manifeſtlie appeares euen by the ſame wordes which the knight cites where he ſayth that, *Indulgences began not till a while after the ſainte, or tremble of Purgatorie.*

By

By which also it doth further appeare that in his passage that renowned Prelate who not onelie with his pen, but also with his sacred bloud defended the Romain faith as well in this as all other points, is not sincerelie dealt with, not pertinentlie alledged to the true state of the question proposed by our aduersarie.

Now other authours which Sir Humfrey cites, onely affirme that much can not be said of Indulgences of certaintie, & as vndoubtedly true seeing scriptures speake not of them expresselie as Durand affirmes: to which purpose also Antoninus speakes, & yet neither of them say that nothing can be spoken with certainetie of them: Which is not contrarie to the doctrine of the Romanists who, altho' they beleeue there is sufficient grounde of the power & truth of them in the Bible, yet they willingly graunte with all, that diuers particulars concerning them are disputable among diuines. And it is cleare that Durand & S. Antoninus as they say onely that *pauca* fewe things can be sayde with certainetie of pardons or Indulgences, & that the scripture doth not speake expresselie of them, so by the same reason euident it is that the same authours graunte that both some things may be pronounced certainly of them, & also that at the least, there is implicit & vnexpressed mention or containement of them in the scripture:

ture: to wit of power of the Church to graunt & vse them, which a lone is sufficient to shewe that they consequētly maintaine the vniuersalite & antiquitie of the Roman doctrine in this point & impugne the contrarie position of the false reformers who absolutelie & obstinatelie denie such power to reside in the Church of God. And as for that which Durand affirmes, that diuers of the auncient Fathers make no mention of Indulgences, yet he doth not say that it doth thence followe that they did reiect the power or vse of them in the Church, & much lesse doth Durand affirme that other auncient Fathers did not mention them; yea if he had affirmed this, yet he him selfe knewe well enuffe that this being but a negatiue argument at the most, it proueth nothing. But that which followes of those auncient Fathers silēce in this matter, is that they had not occasion to speake of them as others had, or at the most, that Indulgences were not much in vse in their tymes which doth not contradict the Romanists, who doe not stand vpon defense of the frequent vse of them in the Primatiue Church, but of the power which they maintaine to be as auncient as the spirituall power of binding & loosing giuen by Christ him selfe to the Pastors of his Church in most generall and ample manner. And to this I adde that which Sir Humfrey for his owne aduantage omitted

Mat. 16.

in the citation of both Durand & Antoninus, to wit, that they both alledge the testimonie of S. Gregorie for the vse & actuall graunte of Indulgẽces, which Pope, say they is reported to haue instituted the Roman stations, which wordes of Durand, & the like of S. Antoninus if the knight had rehearsed as he ought to haue done according to the lawes of plaine dealing, the vse of Indulgences would haue appeared not to be so newe as he indeuores to persuade his reader.

Gregorius tamen loquitur quũ etiam Indulgentias Roma instituit instationibus, vt dicitur. Durand. id 4 sent. d. 20. q. 3.

Touching the citation of Caietan Sir Humfrey proceedes no lesse insincerely, for in the same place which is his 15. Opuscle, he addes that in the fourth of the sentences it is alledged by S. Thomas that S. Gregorie did institute the stations of Indulgences, & producing manie other testimonies out of the Ecclesiasticall decrees he concludes thus. *Out of those texts it is had that the graunte of Indulgences is not onely auncient, but &c.* Where also the reader is to be aduertised that Caietan is corrupted by Sir Humfreys translation of the worde *hinc* or *hanc rhem*, which the author referres to the begining, or certaintie of their begining, not to the Indulgences themselues or power to graunt them.

Ex his hãbetur textibus non solum quod Indulgentiarũ gratia antiqua est in Christi Ecclesia & non nouã inuẽtio, sed habentur clarè quatuor &c. Caiet. Opusc. 15. c. 1.

And doubtlesse Siluester Prierias had the same meaning where he sayde, if so he sayde, that Pardos are not know ne vnto vs by the author-

titie of the ſcripture but by the authoritie of the Church of Roman, for the ſenſe is that they are not expreſſely declared & deliuered vnto vs by the text of the ſcripture in plaine wordes but by the Church whoſe office it is to propoſe ſuch doctrine in particular to the faithfull as she findes not ſo plainely deliuered in the ſcripture as they themſelues can without her directions come to due knowledge of it. And ſurely this author is ſo farre frome denying the Antiquitie of the power & vſe of perdons that he profeſſedly defended the ſame againſt his profeſſed aduerſarie Luther.

And the ſame I ſaye of Eckius & Tecelius, who as Sir Humfrey can not be ignorant were alſo Luthers Antagoniſts euẽ in this particular, to omit that he cites those two authors onely vpõ relation of the Counſel of Trents hiſtorie in English to which as I haue alreader noted we giue no credit. Nay & ſince I writ this at firſt, I finde that Prierias Eckius & Tecelius are falſely charged by the ſame falſe hiſtorie of Trent to haue layde for their grounde of Indulgẽces the Popes authoritie in their impugnation & conuincement of Luther. And the marginall note of that place is yet more falſe, then the text, ſaying that the aduerſaries of Luther proued the doctrine of Indulgences by common reaſons onely. And as for Eckius I haue read his whole treatiſe of Indulgences & ſo I

Pag. 6.

ame ſure he foundeth them not vpon the Popes authoritie either onelie or cheefelie, but principallie vpon ſcripture, for ſo he ſayth page 313. *Indulgentiarum figuræ fuerunt Iubilei in veteri Teſtamento, De his ſumus contenti eo quod habeamus ſolidum S. Paulo fundamentum ne credamur diligentiores in lucroſa. Porro &c.* 2. Cor. 2.

And to the ſenſe of theſe authors may be reduced that which Cnnerus ſayth of the doubtfull manuer of writing of ſome Catholike authors, of Indulgences, if the place be ſincerely related which a man may iuſtely ſuſpect eſpecially for that the knight hath it out of Chamier & at ſecond hand. And in deed the truth is if that authors ſentence had not ben violentlie abrupted before the end of the ſame period which he deliuered with one breath, it would haue plainelie declared that there is nothing for Sir Humfreyes purpoſe of prouing that neither Chriſt nor the Primatiue Fathers (as he ſpeaketh) euer knewe or exerciſed ſuch pardons as are now dayly practiſed in the Church of Rome. For the wordes omitted are thoſe. *Cum in clauibus Eccleſiæ & ſymbolo Apoſtolico clariſſime fundatæ deprehendantur.* That is *ſince that* (Indulgences) *are moſt clearely diſcouered to be founded in the Apoſtolicall ſymbole or Creed, & in the power of the keyes of the Church &c.* Cunerus declam.

And ſo now we ſee that thoſe teſtimonies

doe not proue want of antiquitie or conſent in either ſcripture, Fathers or ſchoolemen for the doctrine of Indulgences themſelues, but onelie at the moſt in ſome acceſſorie points of that Controuerſie, yet not one of them prouing anie ſuch want in the maine of the queſtion aboue declared, no more then he ſhould be thought to proue want of antiquitie & vniuerſallitie in the doctrine of three perſons, & one God, who ſhould affirme the ſame not to be in expreſſe termes contayned in the ſcripture, Fathers, & ſchoolemen iuſte in that manner in which the Church beleeueth & defendeth it. And yet graunting neuertheleſſe that it is truelie contained in the ſame ſcripture in an other equiualent manner, or inexpreſſelie.

As alſo the ſame doth yet more plainelie appeare euen by thoſe ſame wordes which Sir Humfrey cites here out of Alfonſus, which altho' they be not ſincerelie related by him, as leauing out that which moſt conduceth to the explication of that authours true meaning, to wit that, *who but an heretik can denie tranſubſtantiation, the proceſſion of the holie Goſt & Purgatorie becauſe they are not mentioned by auncient authors ſub his nominibus, by theſe names or wordes*. And after: what maruell therefore is it if it happened in this ſorte of Indulgence that, ſaith Caſtro there be not mention made of them in the auncients. By which wordes it is

plaine

plaine this author ſpeakes not abſolutelie of the ſubſtance of Indulgences or of the authoritie to graunte them which indeede is the cheefe queſtion of Controuerſie in this place, & of which he makes no doubt but that it is ſufficientlie contayned in ſcripture & Fathers altho' as he ſaith *minus expreſſe* leſſe expreſſelie. But he onelie ſpeakes of the name as his wordes now related doe teſtifie; or at the moſt of the antiquitie of their cõmon vſe, which not withſtanding it is no matter of faith, yet doth he shewe it not to be ſo new as the ſectaries of our times will haue it: & therefore he addes by way of concluſion, *Quod non eſt tam recens Indulgentiarum vſus quantum iſti hæretici* (meaning the Lutherans) *exprobrant, nam apud Romanos vetuſtiſſimus prædicatur earum vſus vt ex ſtationibus Romæ frequentiſſimis colligi vtcumque poteſt. Et de Beato Gregorio huius nominis primo fertur quod aliquas ſuo tempore conceſſerit.* And in the ſame tenor of wordes he adioyneth that, *etſi pro Indulgentiarum approbatione ſacræ ſcripturæ apertum teſtimonium deſit, non tamen ideo contemnendæ erant quoniam Eccleſiæ Catholicæ vſus à multis annorum ſæculis receptus, tantæ eſt authoritatis vt qui illum contemnat hæreticus merito cenſeatur &c.* By all which it is euident that nothing can be proued by the wordes of Alfonſus againſt the ſubſtance of Eccleſiaſticall Indulgences nor contrarie to the antiquitie &

vniuerſalitie of the Roman doctrine in that point, but rather Sir Humfrey & his brothers are manifeſtlie conuicted of hereſie for contemning the ſame. Now Maior in 4. d. 2. q. 2. is impertinentlie alledged for he onelie affirmes that it's harde to founde authenticallie in ſcripture iuſte that manner of Indulgence which is vſed at this day in the Church: & that ſome of the auncient Fathers made no mention thereof, which the Romaniſts doe not denie for they ſaye *difficilia quæ pulchra*. And ſo that which is hardelie founded is truelie founded. Yet the power & vſe of Indulgences euen as they are now practiſed the ſame Maior defendes as well as other moderne diuines, yea & deduceth the vſe of them from S. Gregorie the great, & thus this author is excuſed & the citer reprooued.

Touching Silueſter Prieras altho· I cannot haue that ſame worke of his which Sir Humfrey cites (if anie ſuch be extant now in the world) yet I haue viewed the treatiſe of Indulgences which he hath in his ſumme, & there I finde that he doth not ſaie all that with which our aduerſarie doth charge him, nay nor ſcarce halfe ſo much, for he neither excludes ſcripture
2. Cor. 2. from the grounde of Indulgences, but expreſſelie cites the ſame place of S. Paule for them which others cite, altho' it be with a *licet* at the and. And much leſſe doth he affirme that the

au-

authority of the Church of Rome & the Popes is greater then the authoritie of the ſcripture, which propoſition if he had vttered & defended obſtinatelie in my opinion he had deſerued the fygot almoſt as well as his aduerſarie Martin: but I perſuade my ſelfe the diſcretion of Prieras was greater then ſo. And in the ſame manner I vehementlie ſuſpect our aduerſaries hath vſed ſome of his Gipſian ſleights in the citation of the place he quoteth. But yet is meaning is onely that Indulgences, that is the preſent vſe of them, is not manifeſtlie declared vnto vs by ſcripture & Fathers as his wordes cited here in the margen inſinuate, abſolutelie graunting both the power & practiſe of them.

Laſtely touching Bellarmine & Valētia, I ſaye they are neyther of them cited by Sir Humfrey either with any great ſincerētie, or to any great purpoſe. For altho' Bellarmin doth inſinuate that there are not manie of the more auncient authors which make mention of Indulgences; yet he doth not affirme that there is want of antiquitie & conſent in the Fathers in this matter as Sir Humfrey doth falſelie deduce out of his wordes, but onelie inſinuateth that the defect of number of the more auncient Fathers which mention Indulgēces, is ſufficientlie ſupplyed by the vſe & cuſtome of the Church without writing, by reaſon (ſaith he) that manie things are retayned in the Church by that meanes onelie. And

Indulgētia nobis per ſcripturā minime innotuit: licet inducatur illud. 2. Cor. 2. Si quid donaui vobis; ſed nec per dicta antiquorū doctorum, ſed modernorum. Dicitur enim Gregorius indulgentiam ſeptennem in ſtationib' Romę poſuiſſe. *Et quia Eccleſia hoc facit & ſeruat credendum eſt ita eſſe quia regitur Spiritu Sancto. Syluester in ſum. verbo Indult. Bell de in-*

dul. l. 2. c. 1. And as for Valentia who as he is cited by the knight, relates out of S. Thomas the opinion of some who called Indulgences a pious fraude to allure men to the performance of those pious workes which are requyred in the forme of the Indulgence graunted, it is true there was such a tenet in those dayes: but as it is true that S. Thomas relates it, so is it also true that he condémes the same for verie dangerous, that which our aduersarie if he had dealt honestlie ought not to haue omitted. And yet not obstanding, he could not but see that position censured by S. Thomas in the verie place cited by Valentia, as also he censureth another little better, to wit that by virtue of the Indulgence itselfe no punishment neither in the iudgement of God, nor the Church could be remitted: notwithstanding all this I saye, yet Sir Humfrey subtillie let it passe, making by that meanes his reader beleeue that the foresaid tenet was long before the dayes of Luther according to the relation of Aquinas (as he saith) an vncondemned opinion of some diuines, & reiected as erroneons by Valentia alone: who neuertheless expresselie affirmeth it to haue beene an opinion hised at by all Orthodox writers, *opinio ab Orthodoxis omnibus explosa*. Nay & which is yet more grosse, Sir Humfrey leaueth quite out some parte of the wordes

wordes of the foresaid opinion as it is rehearsed by Valentia, to wit those which mention satisfaction made to God by reason of the deuotion of the gainer of the Indulgence & value of the pious workes in ioyned him for the obtaining of the same, all which because it sounded contrarie to the doctrine of the pretensiue reformed Churches, it struct Sir Humfrey deafe one that eare, & so he left it out.

I omit diuers particulars which our aduersarie vtters here & there in the progresse of his Paragraffe. Because they either consiste of some inauthenticall relations aboute the vse or rather aboute the abuse of some particular graunts of Indulgences as that out of the office of Saram & out of Guitcherdin: or els they cõsiste in his owne plaine calũnious vntruthes, as that Indulgences are graunted onelie to drawe money frome the grainers: & that the Romanists pretẽd vniuersalitie of Fathers for euerie point of faith: & that the article of Indulgences wantes authoritie of scripture, of all this I saye I need to make no further discussion in regarde the apparent falsitie of it doth sufficientlie confute it selfe & shewes that it proceeds rather frome a man malitiouslie affected & ignorant of the state of the question, & more disposed to cauille then carefull to attaine to the truth of the doctrine. For suppose the abuses were neuer so true (which

as

as in all other things ſom this I confeſſe there haue ben ſome eſpeciallie in the queſtors or inferior adminiſtrators of Indulgences, & may be more: neuertheleſſe theſe abuſes of particular men, doe not impeach the power, & authoritie, & lawfull vſe of the ſame, which onelie is that which my aduerſarie & I haue now in queſtion.

And ſo now for concluſion of this matter we may hence inferre how impiouſlie the ſectaries proceed in the denyall & impugnation of the Indulgences vſed in the Roman Church, which altho' they had no other vtilitie or profit in them then to induce people to the exerciſe of ſuch pious workes as are requyred in the tenor of them, that is faſting, prayer & almes ſo heighly commended in the ſcriptures, & receiuing of the Sacraments, yet in common reaſon ought they not to be reiected, but rather maintained & ſought for with great zeale & deuotion. And ſo now let this ſuffice for the intyre diſcuſſion of this paragraffe, in which I haue founde nothing to the excuſe the author frome the ſame cenſure I haue layd vpon him in the precedent matters.

THE IX PERIOD.

WE are now come to the 10. section of the booke in which Sir Humfrey produceth the testimonies of the Romanists touching the infallible certaintie of the Protestant faith, & the vncertaintie of the Romish. this is his designe, but I ame verily persuaded he will fayle of his purpose. I will examen particulars that the truth may appeare. But before this I must aduertise the reader that in this section there is litle substance to be founde, & it consists cheefly in a large recapitulation of the supposed confessions of the Romanists: as that they haue confessed that iustificatiõ is by faith onely, that the conuersion of the bread into Christs bodie, was not generally receiued by the Fathers, that the certaine & definite number of Sacraments was vnknowne to scripture & Fathers, & that the Indulgences now vsed, haue no authoritie from scripture or Fathers, & the like: all which particulars we haue allreadie disproued in their seuerall places. In substance a great parte of it is but an idle repetition of those falsities which the kingh hath vttered before, with some newe additions to make the number of his lyes more ample & complete & this he performeth with great abundance of wordes of amplification: & thinking to make all sure

calleth

calleth to witnesse both men & Angels: And thus for space of a leafe or two, he bringeth nothing but verbal discourses which with the very breath of any iudicious reader presently vanish away, & so they need no other confutation. Afterwardes he comes to some particulars which I haue not yet touched & of these I will make a breefe examen.

And to omitte those points which I haue before discussed, in his page 242. he indeuoreth to proue out of Bellarmin that the Church of Rome hath ouerthrowne in one tenet all certaintie of true faith, & he performeth it very solidly, because for sooth Bellarmin affirmeth that none can be certaine by certaintie of faith that he receiueth à Sacrament by reason of the vncertainty of the intention of the minister without which the Sacrament can not be made. And the argument the king hu framed of the doctrine of the Cardinall is this. It is a positiue grounde of the Romã religiõ that a Sacrament can not be made without the intention of the minister but the intentiõ of the minister can not be knowne by faith, therfore the Church of Rome hath ouerthrowne in one tenet all certaintie of true faith. I anfere first that al tho' this is the forme which Sir rufreys argument must be reduced vnto if anie it cã haue, neuerthelesse if we should examen it according to the rules of logique ther will scarcely be founde either

forme

forme or figure in it, yet least the knight should hould himselfe too rigorously delt with, as not making profession of that arte, I am content to let that passe and answere secondly that I graunt the maior in this sense viz. That whensoeuer the Preist doth administer a Sacrament it is required that he intends at the least in generall to doe that which the true Church vseth to doe in that action I meane either formally or virtually, & this is defined by the Councell of Trent as a certaine trueth. But in the minor there lyeth secretly a certaine false supposition which is this. That to the faith of a Sacrament is necessarilie required that the intention of the minister in particular cases be knowne by faith which is not true, nor defined by the Councell; because to the faith of a Sacrament is sufficient that faith by which a Christian beleeueth that euery one of those visible signes which the Church proposeth to the people to be beleeued & receiued as Sacraments of the new lawe are instituted by Christ to conferre grace to the receiuers, & that to euery one of them is required a sincere intention to administer or performe that particular action as is was instituted, or as the Tridentine decreeth, *intentione saltem faciendi quod facit Ecclesia*, that is at the least with intention to doe that which the Church doth; & that seriously & not in mockrie: but notwithstan-

ſtanding it is not neceſſary that either he that perſormeth that ceremonie, or he that receiues the ſame, haue certaine knowledge of faith that this or that individual Sacrament hath ben inſtituted with the forſaid intention; but to this a morall certaintie doth ſuffice both in the miniſter & in the receiuer; & the reaſon is becauſe to know whether one hath receiued, or doth truely receiue a Sacrament or not, falleth not vpon the eſſence, or making or marring of a Sacrament as a thing neceſſarily precedent vnto the conſtitution of it, but it is onely a thing conſequent or following the ſame as ſeruing onely to rectify & quiete the conſciences of thoſe that either adminiſter it or receiue it, to the which as being but a morall matter, morall certainty onely is required. And ſurely if all true faith ſhould therefore be ouerthrowne, as Sir Thomas Humfrey inferreth, becauſe of our want of certainty of faith in the receiuers that they receiue true Sacraments quere I pray you, they receiue them, then ſhould it follow by an argument *ad hominem*, that the faith of the reformed were alſo ouerthrowne; for that they themſelues neither haue nor can haue any ſuch certaintie of faith: or if they ſay ther is no faith of any ſuch intention of the miniſter in their religion, ſo doe we ſay the ſame of ours: for altho it is a matter of faith in the Roman Church that the intention of the Preiſt is ne-

ceſſary

ceſſary in generall to the conſtitution of a Sacrament, yet that intention is not neceſſarily knowne by faith in euerie particular caſe, & in this conſiſteth the equiuocation of the whole argument, & if the knight had diſtinguiſhed betweene the intention & the faith of the intention, he might eaſilie haue perceiued that his diſcourſe was founded vpon a falſe foundation. To ſay nothing of the concluſion which although the premiſes were neuer ſo true, yet had they not ben able to inferre ſuch a vaſt conſequence as is the ouerthrowe of all certaintie of true faith, precilely in reſpect of the ſuppoſed want of faith of intention aboute the Sacraments.

And now by this generall anſere may be ſolued what ſoeuer Sir Humfrey ſaith afterwardes of the intention required to the Sacraments in particular. To which I alſo adde that if certaintie of faith were requited in the receiuers of the Sacraments that as often as they receiue them, they receiue true Sacraments *hic & nunc*, & that as often as they want that faith they ouerthrow all certaintie of true faith, then the reformers themſelues were in a more pitifull caſe then the Romaniſts, in regarde that it is vnpoſſible for them to knowne more then either by their owne ſeight, or by relation of others, that the true matter & forme of the Sacraments, be truelie applyed vnto

them: & yet certaine it is that vpon neither of these two knowledges anie supernaturall faith can be founded, but onely either a kynde of naturall cognitiō or knowledge at the most, taken from the sensses, or a certaine morall certitude proceeding from the relation of their parents or others, all which is farre inferior to the knowledge of faith as no man can denie.

That which may by a speciall reason be yet more plainelie vrged against the receiuers of the Sacraments in the reformed Churches, in regarde they are so farre from certaintie of faith of the trueth of their Sacraments in particular, that they cannot possible haue as much as a morall certaintie of the same nay nor morall probabilitie I meane such an one as may iustlie moue a prudent man to giue credit, by reason they haue no certaintie, nor yet probabilitie of the trueth of the vocation & ordination of their ministers, without certainitie of which two conditions, it is well knowne on both sides, that no certaine knowledge of the truth of indiuiduall Sacraments can possiblie be had. And so we see that whereas Sir Humfrey thought he had framed a strong argument against the doctrine of Bellarmin, he onelie heapeth coles vpon his owne head. And from hence also we may gather an easie solution to that which he adderh against the necessitie of the Preists intention in some

of the Sacraments which he ſpecifieth as baptiſme, Order, & Matrimonie.

Touching which matter I deſire the iudicious reader conſider whether it is not much more conformable to reaſon, to the dignity of the Sacraments, to the honour of Chriſt who inſtituted them, & to the confort & ſecuritie of the receiuers, that a ſincere intention of the Preiſt Gods ſubſtitute, be required to the truth & due adminiſtration of them as the Romani Church doth teach & ordaine: or onely ſo, that if the receiuers take them in the name of God, as the reformers ſpeake, it is ſufficient for the miniſter to performe that externall actiō which Chriſt did inſtitude, tho' he doeth it in ieſt or mockery as Luther teacheth, or *animo illuſorio*, that is with an intention or meaning to delude as Kemnitius affirmeth, or to haue no intention neceſſarily required as Sir Humfrey here profeſſeth: this I ſay I leaue to the iudgement of any indifferent man to diſcerne whether the Romaniſts or the reformers proceed more ſafely & religiouſly.

And as for the illations which the knight deduceth out of the neceſſity of the intention of the miniſter in adminiſtration of Sacraments they are ſo ignorant & ſotish, as I ame aſhamed to rehearſe them, for example when he ſayth that if the Preiſt fayles in his intention at the tyme of ſolemnization of matrimonie

the maried people liue all their dayes in adultrie, or fornication: which is a moſt groſſe errour in the knight: for that the Romaniſts & the reformers agree in this that altho' Matrimonie were no Sacrament, & conſequentlie that the maried people should not receiue it as a Sacrament, yet were it ſufficient to free them from adulterie, in regarde they receiue it at the leaſt as a ciuill contract, whatſoeuer the Preiſts intention bee. And if it were not ſo, certainely all ſectaries of this time, & particularlie Sir Humfrey himſelfe for one should liue perpetuallie in that damnable ſtate of adulterie which he mentioneth. And yet this ſequele I am ſure it importes him to denie as earneſtlie as he can if it be but onelie for the conſeruation of his owne, & his wifes honour.

Certitudinẽ autem moralem & humanam quæ ſufficit & vt homo quieſcat ex Sacramẽtis, habemus etiãſi pendeãt ab intentione alterius. Bel. de Sacr. in genere li. 1 c. 28.

And the like foolish & falſe inferences he makes aboute all the reſt of the Sacraments, as alſo aboute the ſucceſſion of the Popes & paſtours of the Church as if by the confeſſion of Romaniſts themſelues there were no certainitie in anie of them: whereas yet he himſelfe citeth Bellarmin in this verie place as teaching that in all theſe things there is at leaſt morall & ſufficient certainitie of their reall exiſtãce & truth. So that all theſe deductions are voyde of all sẽſe reaſon, & trueth, meerlie framed by the knight out of the ſuperfluitie of his braine, & obtruded vpon his reader as confeſſions of his

aduersaries in a peremptorie & odious manner in disgrace of that Church whose doctrine he is not able to impugne in anie more substanciall manner.

In a semblable fashion doth he also prosecute the like captious kinde of argument against diuers other points of the Roman doctrine, as for Example because he findeth in *Biel* & Peter Lombard that they speake not with anie certaintie of the manner how Saints doe vnderstand the prayers of their supplicats, he inferreth that the Romanists are vncertaine touching the doctrine of inuocation of Saints it selfe, which neuertheless is a most false illation for that although there be some vncertaintie in what manner or by what meanes the Saints doe come to knowe our prayers by reason of the diuers opinions of diuines in that particular, yet as well those who Sir Humfrey citeth as also all the rest of the Romanists agree and hould for certaine that Saints are piouslie & profitablie to be inuocated & prayed vnto, all without exception teaching & inculcating the same expresselie in their bookes & writings. Gabriel Biel is so plaine for the doctrine of the Roman Church, that if the knight had not corrupted him both in wordes & sense, he could not haue alledged him with anie coulorable pretense: For in the verie precedent lection to that which he cites against vs,

Biel resolues the question in our fauor saying. *Whence it is apparent that our prayers, & hope of obtaining beatitude by the mediation of the Saints, are not voyde in Heauen: but by order constituted by God himselfe; we ought to recurre to their helpe, & assistance: & perpetuallie implore them with due veneration that we may be saued by their merits.* In which wordes, & the rest following, I am sure there is sufficient to make the author a plaine Papist, yea & much more then Sir Humfrey desires to heare in fauor of the Roman doctrine & so it is cleare he hath corrupted his sense. And nowe for his wordes, he hath likewise corrupted them most peruerselie, by displaceing, & tranferring them from one purpose to an other. For these wordes: *non est certum per omnia*: By which Biel ansers onelie to that question, whether it pertaines to the accidental Beatitude of the Saints to heare our prayers (which question as you see is onelie aboute the manner, or qualitie of the Saints vnderstanding our petitions, not of the maine substance) he respondes: *Non per omnia certum est*. It is not altogether certaine. And yet Sir Humfrey applyes this, as if Biel had said, that it is not certaine that the Saints heare our prayers at all. Yet further connecting vnto the same, those other wordes: *vnde probabiliter dicitur*: Which he also soma't. Insincerelie Englisheth: it may seeme probable: & rehear-

sing

sing them in one series, or tenor, whereas yet they are vttered by their author, manie lynes after, & to an other purpose, where answering to the question before proposed he said thus: *Vnde probabiliter dicitur &c. Whence it is probably said, that altho' it doth not necessarilie follow the beatitude of the Saints, that they heare our prayers: by congruitie, yet God almightie reuealeth vnto them all that is offered vnto them by men.* All which particulars concerning the corruption of this place by the guilie knight, may more plainelie be perceiued in the author himselfe, then I can possible here expresse.

As for the Master of sentences, & Scotus in the 45. d. of the fourth booke, altho' perchance they seeme to one that reades thē superficiallie, nor to speake with certainetie of the inuocation of Saints, yet to the anttentiue reader it appeares clearely they both suppose for certaine, & of which they frame no disputation, that the Angels, & Saints heare our prayers, & that we lawfullie & profitablie praye vnto them, of which points it is most vndoubtedlie to be supposed that those two authors could not be ignorant, nor maintaine the negatiue parte, in regarde the publike letanies in which the inuocation of Saints is expresselie included were vsed in the Church long before their dayes, as histories so commonlie testifie that I need not produce them. Besides that the writings of

the ancient Fathers whoſe ſentences Peter Lombard profeſſedlie collected, as much as was for his purpoſe, & of which Scotus could not be ignorant, are full of the ſame doctrine as in our Catholike Controuertiſts may eaſily appeare to the reader.

And therefore whereas the Maſter vſes the wordes: *non eſt incredibile, & ſcotus, probabile eſt*, they ſpeake not eyther of the abſolute inuocation of Saints, or of our prayers vnto them of which neyther of them propoſes the queſtion: but they applye thoſe wordes to the manner onely of their vnderſtanding our interceſſion. And therefore the Maſter puts the title of the queſtion thus: *quomodo? how or in what manner*, or, *by what* meanes doe the Saints *heare our prayers, & how they interced for vs vnto our Lord?* To which he anſers, *it is not incredible that the Saints which in the ſecret of the face of God, inioye the illumination of the true leight, vnderſtand in contemplation of him ſo much as appertaines eyther to their owne ioye, or our aſſiſtanſe. For as to the Angels, ſo to the Saints who aſſiſte in the Seight of God, our petitions are knowne in the eternall worde.* By which it is euident that Lombard ſpeakes onelie of the meanes by which the Saints vnderſtand the prayers of faithfull ſupplicants. And there being two ſeuerall wayes cheefelie where by the Saints may vnderſtand our prayers: the one by vertue

Quomodo Sancti glorificati audiunt preces ſupplicantium Magiſter in tit. quæſt. d. 45. in 4. ſent.

In abſcondito facie Dei.

tue of their beatitude, or beatificall vision by which they see the prayers directed vnto them by seeing God: the other by special reuelation accidental to their blessednesse. The Master is of opinion, they see them in the worde by vertue of their vision of God, as I conceiue: But Scotus seemes to hould that, the knowlege that Saints haue of our prayers, doeth not necessarilie followe of their beatitude, but is onelie accidental, & by congruitie: & therefore he sayes in his answer to the question. *Dico quod nrn est necesse ex ratione beatitudinis quod beatus videat orationes nostras. Neque regulariter siue vniuersaliter in verbo, quia non est necessaria sequela beatitudinis, neque quod reuelentur, neque talis reuelatio necessario sequitur beatitudinem: Beatitudo enim in obiectis creatis, non transcendit quidditates seu illa quorum essentia visa est necessaria ratio videndi: tamen quia congruum est beatum esse coadiutorem Dei in procurando salutem electi eo modo quo hoc sibi potest competere, & ad istud requiritur sibi reuelari orationes nostras specialiter quæ sibi offeruntur quia illa specialiter innituntur meritis eius tanquam mediatoris perducentis ad salutem quæ petitur, ideo probabile est quod Deus beatis reuelat de orationibus sibi vel Deo in nomine eius oblatis.* That is in English. It is not necessarie by the nature or state of beatitude that the blessed see our prayers, neyther regullarlie or, vniuersallie in the diuine worde, because that

is

is not anie thing which as is it were a neceſſary ſequele of beatitude. Nor that they ar reueiled becauſe neither ſuch a reuelation neceſſarilie followes bertitude: for the beatitude of the vnderſtanding in created obiects tranſcendes not the quidities, or thoſe things the ſight of whoſe eſſenſe is the neceſſarie cauſe of ſeeing. But becauſe it is congruous or conuenient that the bleſſed man be Gods cooperator in procuring the Saluation of the elect, in that manner in which it grees vnto him, and that to this is required that our prayers be reueiled vnto him eſpeciallie thoſe which are repreſented vnto him, for that they eſpeciallie are founded in his merits as a mediator conducting to the ſaluation which is asked. Therefore it is probable that God giues a reuelation to the bleſſed of the prayers offered to him, or to God in his name. Thus Scotus. By which it is manifeſt he onelie here diſcuſſes the diuers wayes by which according to the diuerſitie of opinions in diuinitie, the bleſſed Saints in Heauen vnderſtandes the prayers of vs that liue in this world, houlding for probable that the knowlege which they haue of our ſupplications vnto them is not by any other meanes but by reuelation from God. And in this ſenſe he ſpeakes when he ſaith *probabile eſt* it is probable, & not becauſe he held the inuocation of Saints it in ſelfe as a matter onelie probable,

his

this being quite contrarie to his cited wordes as being aboute the manner of the saints vnderstanding our prayers which necessarily implyes that the prayers them selues directed vnto them are lawfully made. And so now it clearelie appeares by all these wordes & circumstances that these two famous diuines are as ranck Romanists as the rest in this particular, in regarde they call not in question the lawfulnes of prayer to Saints in it selfe but onelie the condition or qualitie of it.

And this I haue added of the doctrine of Scotus not as vsed or abused by my aduersarie but onely the better to declare the true meaning of the Master of sentence.

And as for Caietan whome also Sir Humfrey produceth to the same purpose, it is manifest euen out of the wordes cited by him, that he onely speakerh of some want of certaintie in the miracles which the Church vseth as an argument in the Canonization of saints by reason that altho' as he confesseth expressely, they be most authenticall, yet are they not saith he, *omnino certa* altogether certaine, because the credit thereof depends vpon the reportes of men. But for all this neither doth he affirme absolutelie that miracles are the grounde wherein the Church foundes the Canonization of the saints (as Sir Humfrey affirmeth most corruptelie translatinng his

wordes

wordes omitting those. *Quæ maxime authentica sunt*: & for *ab Ecclesia suscipiuntur*, putting in Inglish *wheron the Church grounteth the Canonization*, and detorting them to that sense as the reader may clearly perceiue by conferring the translation with the quotation in Latin) nor yet doth the same Caietan either in this or anie other place of his wordes deny either the certaintie of the doctrine of the inuocation it selfe, or yet the doctrine of the certaintie of the Canonization, but he onely, at the most, sayth that the Church cannot receiue full, but onely humane certainty from such miracles alone as she hath by relation of particular men, not euidentlie operated in the eyes of the whole Church.

And according to this we may easily answere to the saying of S. Augustin, that manie soules are tormented in hell whose bodies are honored in earth, for this S. Augustin speakes onelie of certaine suppositious saints whome the cõmon people honored for true saints, as it is manifest by the example which the same S. Aug. produceth out of Sulpitius who relateth how the vulgaritie did long celebrate one for a martyr who afterwardes appeared & tould them he was damned. And the like is related of a discouerie which S. Martin made of a false martyr: which particular examples of errour in the common people ought not in common

pru-

prudence to preiudicate the certaintie of the doctrine of honour due vnto such as the whole Church in all succeeding ages hath honored for true saints & blessed freinds of God. Neither doth S. Augustin in the cited place speake to anie such purpose of calling in question the generall doctrine & practice of the Church in the points of honour or inuocatton of Saints as may appeare by that in other places of his workes he expresselie auerreth the same as in his first sermon of S. Peter & Paule, & in his 44. ep. where he hath this notable wordes. *In Petro quis honoratur nisi ille qui defunctus est pro nobis?* Who is honored in Peter but he that dyed for vs? And in his 84. treatise vpon the gospell of S. Iohn he sayth. *At the table we doe not so remember martirs as we doe remember others who rest in peace, that we also praye for them, but rather so that they praye for vs.* And in his booke *de cura pro mortuis* Cap. 14. he expresselie speaketh of the prayer of Saints for those that are buried neare vnto their tumbes. All which sayeings of S. Augustin are plaine enuffe, & yet our noble aduersarie turnes the cat in the pan & persuades his reader that he flatly denied inuocation of saints, but to conuince him & his followes yet more plainelie I will conclude this point with the wordes of the same S. Augustin in psal. 99. where speaking of the worship of

Angels

Angells against the Gentils, he sayth: *vtinam & vos colere vellet vs, facile enim ab ipsis discere tis nõ illos colere. Would to God you also would worship them for you might easily learne of them not to worship them.* That is not to adore them as Gods but as saints. To this I adde that Bellarmin professeth he could neuer finde the foresayd wordes in S. Augustin, neither could I hauing deligently searched for them; euer finde them. In this same manner Sir Humfrey proceeds in the matter of Purgatory. For wher as S. Augustin in his 69. chapter of his Enchir. speaking not of the existẽce of Purgatory but onelie of some particulars which are consequent vnto it propoundeth a question whether the soule seperated from the bodie be subiect to those inordinate affections to temporall things to which shee was subiect when shee was united to the bodie, to which question because Sainct Augustin answereth doubtfully & with vncertainetie, the kinght handleth the matter so nimblie & cunninglie that the reader may easilie be persuaded by him that S. Augustin was doubtfull of the existence or being of Purgatorie it selfe & so for the greater furtherance of this persuation, wher S. Augustin speaking onelie of the foresayd question saith it is not incredible that some such thing should be after this life, honest Sir Humfrey to make his market the

better

better *foysteth in the word Purgatory* in the beginning of the sentence as if that were it of which S. Augustin saith *quæri potest*, , it may be questioned, & so deludeth his reader egregiously with the falsification both of his wordes & sense.

Some other particulars touching this same metter Sir Humfrey addeth partely impertinent & partlie false. Impertinent, for example, is that passage of his 248. page. in which he affirmes that Bellarmine saith it is doubtfull whether the punishment of Purgatorie be by materiall fyre, or some other meanes? For what incertaintie soeuer there were in the Church aboute this point: yet this being I say not touching the paine it selfe but onelie the qualitie or maner of the paine, it is out of our controuersie in this matter, which is not here of the circumstances of Purgatorie, but of the existence or being of Purgatorie it selfe: the manner, continuation of time, & instruments by which the soules are punished & the like, being left to Catholike diuines to dispute at there pleasure. And so this allegation of Bellarmin by the knight against the certaintie of the Roman doctrine concerning Purgatorie, is as farre out of quare as if he had alledged eyther our diuines or his owne to proue there is neyther Hell nor Heauen, because they make disputable questions

or

or doubts, concerning the paines of the one, & glorie of the other.

And yet besides this, it is not true that Bellarmine makes any such doubt of the materialitie of the fire of Purgatorie, but he expressely auerres that the common sentence of diuines is for it. Adding that it is not in deed a matter of faith, because it is in no place defined by the Church. Yet saith he, it is a most probable opinion (besides other reasons he alledges) in regarde of the cōsent of the Scolastikes, which cannot be contemned without temeritie. And now supposing the Cardinal speakes so plainelie: Sir Humfrey proceeded not sincerelie in that he insinuates the contrarie by a defectiue citation of his wordes.

Secondlie he falsely affirmeth that S. Greg. gaue the first *Credo* to Purgatorie, & that he learned it by reuelations, insinuating also that the Roman Church groundeth the faith of Purgatory vpon the spirits & apparitions of dead men, which is all false & calumnious, for that neither S. Gregorie nor any other Romanists euer founded anie doctrine of faith vpon such groundes, but onelie at the most, vse them for confirmation & illustration of those arguments which are founded in scripture for that purpose as their writings make manifest.

And that S. Gregorie was not the first esta-

blisher

ſhed, or gaue the firſt *Credo* (as the knight ſpeakes) to Purgatorie, it is manifeſtly conuinced by the teſtimonies of ſuch Fathers as liued long before him, & make expreſſe mention of it. And to omit others yet more auncient, S. Gregorie Nyſſen in his oration of the dead, hath theſe plaine wordes: *Non poterit à corpore egreſſus diuinitatis particeps fieri niſi maculas animo immixtas purgatorius ignis abſtulerit.* The departed can not be partaker of the diuinitie, vnleſſe purgatorie fyre take away the ſpots reſiding in his ſoule. adding after wordes: *alijs poſt hanc vitam purgatorio igne materiæ labes abſtergentibus.* Others clenſing after this life the corruption of the matter with purgatory fyre. I indeed finde theſe words ſmal different in an other tranſlation, as alſo the wordes of an other pregnant place of the ſame author to the ſame purpoſe in his precedent page aboute the mideſt of the oration: but the ſenſe is the ſame in all places & verſions,

S. Auſtin alſo in the 16. of his 50. homilies ſaith thus. *Qui temporalibus pœnis digna geſſerunt per ignem quendam purgatorium tranſibunt, de quo Apoſtolus ait: ſaluus erit ſic tamen quaſi per ignem.* Thoſe who haue done things deſerming temporall paines, ſhall paſſe by a certaine purgatorie fyre, of which the Apoſtle ſaith: *he ſhall be ſaued, yet ſo as it were by fire.* So that

all this which the kinght vtters of S. Gregorie, is friuolous, & vntrue, as these testimonies conuince.

Onelie one place which Sir Humfrey citeth out of S. Augustin, carieth some more apparence then the rest. Where in his booke *de vanitate seculi* the first chapter he saith thus. Knowe that when the soule is separated from the bodie, presentlie it is either placed in Paradise for it good workes, or cast headlong into the bottome of hell for it sinnes. To which I say First, that booke attributed to Sainct Austin is not founde in the Index of his seuerall workes collected by Possidonius nor cited by Beda in his commentarie vpon the Apostles of S. Paule consisting of the sentences of S. Aug. Wherefore it is noted by Bellar. de scrip. Eccles. not to be his: yet because it is printed among his workes & perhaps composed by some ancient author: I answere Secondlie that suppose it is his worke yet S. Augustin speaketh onelie of those that either dye in mortall sinne, or of those that die quite free from sinne & all punishment due vnto it, as martyrs doe.

Thirdlie I answere that S. Augustin speaketh there onelie of those two places to which all soules are finallie destinated, and to one of which generallie speaking, & for the most parte, euerie one presentlie passeth, yet as there is no rule so generall which doth not admit excep-

ception, ſo doth this generall ſentence of ſainct Auguſtin include thoſe onelie who dye in either of thoſe ſtates which he mentioneth in that place, that is either abſolutely in ſuch good workes as preſentlie deſerue paradiſe, or els in ſuch ill workes as preſentlie deſerue the paines of hell; & yet it admitteth an exception in others who paſſe out of this world in neyther of thoſe two ſtates, but are of thoſe whome the ſame *S. Auguſtin* in an other place calleth *nec valde bonos nec valde malos*: or, *mediocriter malos & mediocriter bonos*. Neyther verie good, nor verie euill, and of whome he alſo meaneth when in his firſt booke of care for the dead he ſayth *non dubium eſt orationem prodeſſe defunctis*, it is no doubt but prayer is profitable to the dead, which ſpeaches hee would newer haue vttered if hee had euer denyed the faith of Purgatorie & that this is S. Auſtins true ſenſe, it is plaine in regard it was ſufficient for his purpoſe in that place, whoſe intent is onely in generall to perſuade to virtue & good lyfe, that when men come to die they may be found in ſtate rather to go preſentlie to heauen thē to hell, to which purpoſe of his becauſe it was impertinent to mention Purgatorie, therfore he paſſed it in ſilence, wher as yet in other places where it cometh in his way, he doth not omit it.

Enchyr. c. 110. & lib. de cura pro mort. cap. 1.

Laſtely I aduertiſe the reader of the ſmale fi-

delitie which Sir Humfrey vſeth in the citation of this place of S. Auſtin traſlating thoſe words *pro meritis bonis: for his good merits, his good works*, flying from the worde merit out of his Puritanicall ſpirit as a beare doth from the ring.

Frō hence Sir Hūfrey paſſeth to proue the vncertaintie of Indulgēces & honour of images by the teſtimonies of the Romaniſts, but the trueth is none of them proue anie vncertainlie amōg the Romaniſts touching the ſubſtantiall points themſelues, for all the authours which he citeth here for this purpoſe doe vniformelie conſent in both thoſe particulars of exhibition of honour to images, & aboute the power & lawfullneſſe of the vſe of Indulgences as wee haue showed before.

And onelie ther is ſome vncertainlie in that which is not determined by the Church, as for example how farre Indulgences are extended, & aboute the begining of the practiſe, what maner of houour is due to images, & the like, which queſtions are out of the ſubiect of this ſection the title of which is, if Sir Humfrey remembreth, of the certainlie of the reformers faith, & vncertainlie of the Romish faith, & not of ſuch diſputable queſtions as the Romaniſts in the cited places ſpeake of. Wher alſo it is to be noted by the way that the kinght *abuſeth S. Thomas*, firſt in that he affirmeth him to teach that the image of Chriſt is to be adored

adored with diuine honour. For although it is true that S. Thomas ſayth that ſeeing that Chriſt is adored with adoration of latria, it is conſequent that his image is to be adored with adoration of *Latria*: neuertheleſſe the ſame S. Thomas addeth afterwardes, *non propter ipſam imaginem, ſed propter rem cuius imago eſt*, meaning that altho' both Chriſt & his image be adored with the ſame externall action of diuine honour which he calleth adoration of *Latria*, yet is not the Latria it ſelfe or diuine honour in ſpirit & truth attributed or exhibited to the picture, but onelie to Chriſt himſelfe by reaſon of his diuinitie, which diuinitie as S. Thomas knew it not to be truelie & reallie in the picture, ſo knew he alſo that diuine worſhip ought not to be giuen to the ſame not as much as by accident, but onelie that the externall adoration, or externall action of *Latria* or the matter of it was ſo to be exhibited to the image that the formall parte ther of, that is the affection of the mynde ought wholelie to be caſt vpon Chriſt himſelfe repreſented by the ſame.

Secondlie I ſay that the knight abuſeth S. Thomas in that he calleth him the founder of image worſhip, whereas yet he himſelfe had cited the ſeuenth Synod immediatelie before which vſeth the ſame terme of *adoration*, and that which is more the foreſayd Synod is al-

ledged by Sir Humfrey in another place for *the authour of idolatrie*, which neuertheleſſe was celebrated ſome hundreths of yeares before Sainct Thomas of Aquin was borne. And altho' this doctrine of his is ſome what obſcure in the termes which he deliuereth it, & ſoundeth harſhelie in the eares of the common people, yet as it is true in the ſenſe he ſpeaketh it, ſo may it alſo be ſo explicated by paſtours, & preachers, that euen children themſelues may be capable of it, eſpeciallie if firſt they be tould in generall that no picture is to be honored by it ſelfe, without relation, or reference to the prototype, or thing it repreſents, or for itſelfe; & that whenſoeuer they exhibit anie act of honour towardes an image, they muſt withall fixe their mynde & affection vpon that onelie which it repreſenteth, referring the whole action finallie & laſtelie not to the picture, but to the thing pictured: euen as they doe who bowe or make courtiſie to a man whome they ſalute & honour by touching his garment (as the fashion in ſome places) in which action of honour altho' the exterior ſigne is directed as well to the apparell as to the man him ſelfe, or rather more immediatelie to the apparell then to the perſon, yet the internall affection of the ſaluter is ſettled vpon the perſon onelie where finallie it ſtayeth & remayneth. An ſo it is in the worship of the images of Chriſt & his Saincts,

Saints, in which there is no more daunger or showe of idolatrie then there is danger of exceſſe of ciuill reuerence towardes him whoſe garment is honored in the manner before deſcribed. And according to this if Sir Humfrey & his blynde mates had but light of vnderſtanding to conceiue it, they should not need to feare anie danger of idolatrie in the Romaniſts, tho' they were neuer ſo ignorant, or ſimple, but thoſe might more iuſtlie feare ſpirituall idolatrie in themſelues who doe ſo much adore the Idol of their owne priuate ſpirit that they will not yeald to the iudgement of the moſt vniuerſall Church, and to thoſe who are both farre more in number, & incomparablie farre more learned & religious then all the impugners of honor due to the images of Chriſt and his Saints.

And yet vpon ſuppoſition of this ſame falſe idol of his owne conceite that all kynde of reuerẽce done to any kynde of image is idolatry, Sir Humfrey doth moſt shamefullie calumniate *Gregorius de Valentia* affirming him to maintaine that there is a kynde of lawfull idolatrie. Whereas the foreſaid learned diuine onelie ſayth that a man might not obſcurelie gather out of S. Peters wordes in his firſt epiſtle chapter 34. verſ. 3. that he inſinuateth that ſome worship of images to wit, of ſacred images, is lawfull, & reight, by reaſon that ſainct

Peter ſpeaking againſt idolatrie, he calleth it not abſolutelie worship of images, but vnlawfull worship of images, *illicitos ſimulacrorum cultus*. Which diſcourſe of Valentia how well grounded it may ſeeme, I will not diſpute. But this I aſſure my ſelfe that defence of idolatrie was ſo farre from the toughts of that pious man (as plainelie appeareth by the reſt of his doctrine euen in the place cited) that if Sir Humfrey either had not beene verie full of corrupted meaning, or had not had great want of matter for the finishing of his falſe dealing in this ſection, & for his laſt *plaudite* there in, hee would not haue had the face to abuſe ſo much the innocencie of ſo ſincere a writer. Eſpeciallie conſidering that altho' Valentia had committed ſuch a groſſe errour as to defende ſome kynde of Idolatrie to be lawfull, yet had his errour ben wholelie impertinent to proue the vncertaintie of the Romish faith in the doctrine of honour of images, which is the point here in controuerſie; of which Valentia being knowe not to haue euer doubted in anie parte of his workes, whatſoeuer orher abſurditie he might be ſuppoſed to haue taught in that matter, it can not argue anie diſagreement from the reſt of the Romaniſts in this particular,

The knight alſo citeteth Bellarmin & Canus But I haue before ſufficientlie declared their

their meaning in an other occasion, and as for Canus, he by laboring to establish his owne singular opinion that matrimonie is no Sacrament but onelie a ciuill contract except it be celebrated by a Preist with sacred & solemne wordes as he is an Ecclesiasticall minister, onelie alledgeth the vncertaintie of the doctrine of diuines touching the determinate matter, & forme of that Sacrament, and aboute the manner how it giueth grace, or rather when it giueth grace & when it doth not, by reason he holds it vncertaine amõg diuines whether it be a sacramẽt or not, except in those cases in which it is celebrated by the Preist, & by cõsequence he holdes it vncertaine among diuines whether in those occasions it conferres grace to the receiuers, which he will not haue for a matter of faith, nor yet more then the mote common opinion, & therefore he saith. *Nego scholæ certo constantique decreto definitum matrimonium sine Ecclesiæ ministro contractum, esse vere & proprie Sacrnmeneum, nego eam rem ad fidem & religionem pertinere.* Yet notwithstãding all diuines agree & Canus with them, that matrimonie is truelie one of the seuen Sacraments: & consequentlie that which Canus sayth in the place cited is not for the knights purpose. And so now I will end this section in which our aduersarie in steed of prouing the infallible certainetie of the reformed faith as he promised in the be-

Si hoc, (matrimoniũ) inquã, argumẽtẽtur Sacramentũ Ecclesiæ non esse, tũc Catholicus respõdeat fidenter, animose defendat, secure contra pugnet. Canus l. 8. c. 5.

beginning, by reaſon of his vnfaithfull proceeding he hath loſt all certaintie of his owne humane faith for which he deſerueth a moſt rigorous cenſure.

The X. Period.

THis Period ſhall conteine the eleuenth ſection of the knights booke, in which He indeuoreth to proue by the teſtimonies of his aduerſaries that there is greater benefit, confort & ſaftie of the ſoule in his faith, then in the Romish. And this his taske he beginneth with great grauitie ſaying that he proceeds from the certaine way to the ſafe way. Againſt which poſition neuertheleſſe if one were diſpoſed to proceed according to rigour of Philoſophie, he might eaſilie demonſtrate a plaine impoſſibilitie in it by an argument *ad hominem*. For if as Sir Humfrey houldes there is no certaintie in the Romish faith & way, & that all the certaintie is in his owne as he hitherto hath labored to shewe, then can he not truelie ſay that his way is the ſafer way, for that the worde ſafer inuolueth a compariſon betweene two which are both ſafe, becauſe a compariſon as Philoſophie teacheth, cannot be but betwixt things of the ſame common nature, *comparatio non eſt niſi inter res eiuſdem generis*. Wherefore ſince that according to the tenet of Sir Humfrey

frey there is neyther certaintie nor ſafetie in the Romish faith, & yet that, as he ſuppoſeth, they are both in his owne, it is conſequent that altho' it were a ſafe way, yet vpon his ſuppoſition it cannot poſſible be truelie called either a ſafer way, or of more confort & benefit then the Romish way. To ſay nothing of our knights preſumption & folly in offering to call that a more ſafe, more confortable, & more profitable way to the ſoule, which as yet he hath not shewed with anie probabilitie either before or now in this ſection, to haue anie one of thoſe attributes in it, but hath beene rather by mee alreadie conuinced to be voyde of them all. Ad altho' this generall anſere might ſerue for all Sir Humfrey bringeth in this place, as being in ſubſtance but a newe repetition of the ſame points of doctrine of which he treated in ſeuerall places before: yet to giue him fuller ſatisfaction, and becauſe tho' the doctrine be the ſame, yet the application is different: I will deſcend to particular examen of it.

He begins with Bellarmin whom he citeth as a confeſſer of the all ſufficientie of ſcripture as he tearmeth it, but it is as cleare as day that Bellarmin made not anie ſuch confeſſion ther being not anie ſuch worde or ſenſe to be foũde in his workes, but rather the quite contrarie is founde euen in the ſame booke which Sir Humfrey here citeth, in which he expreſſelie con-

confeſſeth & profeſſeth traditions to be neceſſarie beſides the ſcriptures, yea & in the very next wordes to thoſe which the knight citeth he addeth that all other things (meanig beſydes thoſe which the Apoſtles publikelie & commonlie preached to all men) are not written. His wordes are theſe in Latin. *Dico illa omnia ſcripta eſſe ab Apoſtolis quæ ſunt omnibus neceſſaria, & quæ ipſi palam omnibus vulgo prædicauurunt, alia autem non omnia ſcripta eſſe.* I ſay that all thoſe things are written by the Apoſtles which are neceſſarie to all men, & which they openlie preached to all vulgarlie or commonlie, but all other things are not written. Which laſt wordes not with ſtanding they are a parte of the ſame poſitiõ or ſentence, & conteine the very point of difficultie in this controuerſie: yet by a notorious impoſture Sir Humfrey left them out, & ſo at one ſtroake quite corrupteth both Bellarmins ſenſe & ſentence. Wherfore, *qui legit intelligat*, he that ſhall read Bellarmine in the place cited by the knight, that is *de verbo Dei non ſcripto lib. 4. cap. 11.* Will eaſilie preceiue him to be ſo farre frome the confeſſing all ſufficiency of ſcripture in that ſenſe in which the reformers take it, that the verie title of his booke, which is of the vn written worde, doth manifeſtlie conuince the contrarie. And as for the wordes which Sir Humfrey cited altho' we take them in that man-

mangled manner in which he hath rehearſed them yet if they had ben reight vnderſtood by him, I ame perſuaded he could haue founde no iuſte coulor to produce them in fauour of himſelfe. For that it is manifeſt by thoſe two limitations, *neceſſarie for all men, & preached generally to all men*, that the Cardinalls meaning could not be that abſolutelie all things which are neceſſarie for euerie perſon or ſtate of perſons in particular, or as the logitians ſpeake, neceſſarie either *pro ſingulis generum* or *pro generibus ſingulorum*, are written in the ſcriptures: but onely Bellarmin meant that altho' all thoſe things are written which all men both in generall & in particular muſt neceſſarilie knowe, & haue for the obteining of ſaluation, yet that there are ſome other things neceſſarie to ſome particular perſons or to ſome particular ſtates of perſons included in that generall number of all men, which are not written, as namelie aboute the Gouernment of the Church & adminiſtration of the Sacraments, & in particular the Baptizme of children, & the rites of the ſame, & that the beptizme of Heretikes is valid. All which Bellarmin doth ſo plainelie ſpecify that it is impoſible for him that reades & vnderſtands him, to doubt of this his meaning.

And yet not vnlike to this doth Sir Humfrey proceed with the ſame Bellarmin who

me he citeth to the ſame purpoſe in his firſt booke of the worde of God: wher out of theſe his wordes, *the ſcripture is a moſt certaine, & moſt ſafe rule of beleeuing*, the kinght concludeth that it is a ſafer way to rely wholely vpon the worde of God which can not erre, then vpon the Pope or Church which is the authoritie of man, ſayth hee, & may erre. Which concluſion neuertheleſſe is moſt falſe, & captious, as well in regarde that according to Sir Humfreys owne confeſſion Bellarmin houldeth the ſcripture to be but a partiall rule of faith; as alſo & cheeflie becauſe when Bellarmin calleth the ſcripture *a moſt certaine, & moſt ſafe rule*, he doth not exclude the authoritie of the Church or diuine tradition, but expreſſelie includeth them both as the other parte of the totall rule of faith, which ſcripture alſo, ſo onelie, & not otherwiſe, he calleth with great reaſon *regula credendi certiſsima & tutiſsima*, knowing neuertheleſſe on the contrarie & ſuppoſing for certaine that with out the authoritie of the Church & traditions the ſcripture can neither be knowne to be true Scripture, nor in what ſenſe it is to be vnderſtood, & conſequentlie as Sir Humfrey taketh it, it is not either an all ſufficient, certaine, or ſafe rule, & by & an other conſequence, it can much leſſe be imagined to be a ſafer way to relie wholelie vpon the written worde as the

Page 258.

refor-

reformers doe then to rely vpon both the ſcriptures, & the authoritie of the Church & diuine traditions, as doe the Romaniſts, taking God for their Father in the writtē worde, & the viſible Church for their mother in the knowledge, interpretation, & ſenſe of the ſame.

And thus wee ſee by this diſcourſe, that Sir Humfrey prouethnothing but his owne diſhoneſt dealing with Bellar, whom beſides that which I haue alreadie showed, he doth more then impudenlie belie in that he affirmeth him to allowe the worde of God to be but a pertiall rule of faith, which Bellarmin doth not ſay, but onelie that the ſcripture is a partiall rule, not denying but the worde of God in all it latitude is a totall rule of all the Chriſtian & Catholike faith, but yet ſuppoſing for certaine that the ſcriptures are not totallie conuertible with the worde of God, but that they are diſtinct things the one from the other, as a parte is from the whole which any man of common iudgement may eaſilie perceiue. And if theſe be the trickes & ſhifts by which Sir Humfrey meaneth to make Bellarmin a confeſſer of his reformed religion, in ſteed of gaining him, he will looſe his owne faith & credit. Page 2,8,

The knight ſtill paſſeth on his way, & tells his reader it is a ſafer way to adore Chriſt Ieſus ſitting on the reight hand of God the Father

father then to adore the Sactamentall bread which depends vpon the intentiõ of the Preist. But I tell him againe that the safest way of all is to adore Christ both in Heauen, & wherſoeuer els he is. And he himſelfe hath tould vs his bodie & blood are in the Sacrament, wher if wee will not be accounted infidels wee moſt conſtantlie beleeue he is. And ſo we ſay with that moſt auncient & vanerable Father Saint Cyrill of Ieruſalem, *ſince that Chriſt himſelfe affirmeth ſo, & ſaith of the bread: this is my bodie, who dareth hereafter to doubt of it? & he alſo confirming, & ſaying: this is my bloud, who can doubte, & ſay it is not his bloud?*

Hoc eſt corpus meum: hic eſt ſanguis meus. Math 26. Mark & Luc. 22.

And ſuppoſing this his reall preſence which we Romaniſts trulie beleeue with auncient S. Cyrill & the reſt of the Fethers, the ſafeſt way is to adore him in the Sacrament & not as ſitting at the reight hand of his Father onelie. But as for you reformers as it can not be ſafe for you to denie Chriſts reall preſence in the Euchariſt, ſo neither is it ſafe for you to refuſe to adore him there where in the true Sacrament he is truelie preſent. I knowe Sir kinght you make your compariſon betweene the adoration of Chriſt in Heauen & the adoration of the Sacramentall bread, but it proceds vpon a falſe ſuppoſition, for the Romaniſts adore not the bread, but Chriſt vnder the forme of bread, whoſe exiſtence there,

doth

doth not ſo much depend vpon the intention of the Preiſt, but that ſufficiēt certaintie may be had of the ſame & at the leaſt much more then you can haue that you receiue a true Sacrament whe you take the bread at the miniſters hand, who if he hath no intention to doe it as Chriſt did when he gaue it to his diſciples, then may you receiue as much at your owne table as at the communion table. But the trueth is that all this is nothing but captious cogging in Sir Humfrey; for proofe of which he moſt impertinentlie produceth S. Aug. *de bono perſ. lib.* 13. *cap.* 6. Wher he hath not a worde to this purpoſe but onelie treateth there of the ſupernaturall actions of man, ſaying that to the end our confeſſion may be humble & lowlie, it is a ſafer way to attribute them wholelie to God, becauſe although we will, yet it is God that worketh in vs to worke. All which is quite out of this matter, & ſerueth for nothing but to ſtoppe holes with a vane florish graunded onelie vpon the wordes *ſafe way* which the knight founde in S. Auguſtin to ſounde to his owne tune & ther vpon founded a verball argument. And the like dictionariall maner of proofe doth he vſe wherby to showe his ſafer way in the points of priuate Maſſe & communion in both kyndes but moſt rediculouſly.

For whereas he findeth in ſome of the Ro-

maniſts that the Maſſe as being not onelie a ſacrifice but alſo a Sacrament is both more commendablie adminiſtred & more frutfullie receiued when both Preiſt & people together are partakers of it, Sir Humfrey applyeth this to the Raphſodie of the reformed Churches: which neuertheleſſe hath not a ſcrap in it either of true ſacrifice or Sacrament, but is onely a pore hungerie ſcamling of bread & wine not conformable either to the forme of the ancient Lythurgies of S. Chryſoſtome or S. Baſil, nor euer heard on in the Chriſtian world before the dayes of Luther, and of ſo ſmale eſtimation euen among themſelues that if it chance to fall, they will ſcarce take paines to take it from the grounde, as may appeare by a prittie paſſage of that nature which not manie yeares paſt I receiued from the mouth of one who was then of the miniſtrie, what he is nowe I knowe not, who tould me that coming in to a certaine Church, the miniſter as he deliuered the communion to his parishoners did let a peace fall from him, but there was not one in the whole congregation excepting a dogge that showed ſo much deuotion towardes their vnuenerable Sacrament as once to offer to take it from the grounde. It is true he tould me withall that the honeſt miniſter by taſting a little to often of the cup was ſome what diſtempered in his head, but that me thought was but a pore excuſe

enſe for a man of his coate, & a teacher of reformed doctrine, eſpeciallie at ſuch a tyme & in ſuch an occaſion. Which want of reſpect in the reformed brothers towards their communion, doth yet further appeare if we compare it with the extraordinarie great diligence & care which the Preiſts & people vſe in the Roman Church for the auoyding of all Kynde of irreuerence towardes the holie Euchariſt as both the rubrickes of the Miſſal, the ancient Canons, & dayly practice teſtifie, in ſo much that one, & perhaps the cheefeſt reaſon of the reſtrainte of the Sacramentall Cup to the laytie was for the auoyding of ſuch irreuerences as might eaſilie haue happened amõg ſuch multitudes of people as vſe to Communicate at one tyme in the Roman Church. So that now we ſee it was great abſurditie in Sir Humfrey to argue the greater ſaftie of the doctrine of his Church out of that which the Romaniſts ſpeake onelie of their owne, eſpeciallie conſidering there is not one worde of ſafetie to be founde in anie of the places cited by him, the authours of them not intending to show anie leſſe ſafetie to be foũde either in the doctrine or practice of the Roman Church concerning priuate Maſſe & ſingle cõmunion, but onelie at the moſt, that ſome more ſpirituall profit would redounde to the people then nowe doth, if either their deuotion were ſo

farre extended as that in euerie Maſſe ſome would communicate, or that the Church, in other reſpects had greater reaſon to permit the vſe of the Chalis to the laitie then not to permit it, alwayes ſuppoſing as a certaine trueth that not withſtanding in ſome reſpects the contrarie to that which is nowe practized might be more profitable yet, that all circumſtances conſidered that is the ſafeſt for mens conſciences which is done according to the preſent cuſtome of that Church which is knowne euen by our aduerſaries to haue viſibly ſucceeded from the Apoſtles, at the leaſt perſonallie, & is alſo knowne euen by Iewes & gentils to be the moſt vniuerſall Church in the Chriſtian world. And let this be ſufficient to redargue the proceedings of the knight in this matter, yet not omitting that two of the authours he citeth for Romaniſts to wit the Apoſtata Deane & Caſſander, are not ſuch, & that in the citation of *Bellarmin* he vſeth one of his accuſtomed trickes, & whoſe wordes although he rehearſeth them truelie in the margen, yet he tranſlateth them *corruptedlie*. For whereas Bellarmin ſaith that the Maſſe in which communicants are preſent, is more perfect & legitimate, *ex hac parte*, that is in as much as it is ordained to the ſpirituall refectiō of the people, the knight omitteth in his tranſlation the wordes *ex hac parte*, & by that tricke doth

nota-

notablie peruert Bellarmin's meaning, making the reader beleeue he affirmed that absolutelie, which neuertheleſſe he did expreſſelie & purpoſelie vtter with limitation, with an intention to showe that altho' in one reſpect priuate maſſe is leſſe perfect, & leſſe conformable to the ancient cuſtome of the Church in regarde of the profit of the people, yet that absolutelie in it ſelfe it is as perfect & lawfull as that in which communicants are preſent.

Furthermore touching the mariage of miniſters, Sir Humfrey ſayth it will appeare by the confeſſions of the Romaniſts that it is the ſafer way to liue chaſtlie in matrimony thē by a ſingle life to hazarde their ſoules by incontinēcie, thus the knight which if he meanes of the miniſters of his owne miſreformed Church onelie, I will eaſilie graunt that ſuppoſing their ſlipperie inclination to lecherie, and the ſmale meanes they vſe for mortification of the flesh & conſeruation of chaſtitie, it is a ſafer way in my opinion for them to marrie then to liue a ſingle life, eſpecillie conſidering they are no true Preiſts but onelie equiuocall Clergie men both in Order & function, & that if they had not wiues it is to be doubted the maydes of their parishes would ſcarcelie liue with out danger among them. But if Sir Humfrey ſpeakes of Roman Preiſts which haue true vocation, true ordination & ſacred function, then

I will say with diuers graue authors that if the Preists of the old testament obserued those dayes continencie in which they sacrificed by their turnes, then ought the Preists of the new testament to obserue chastitie euerie day, because, they euerie day offer sacrifice.

Vid. Hier. in c. 1. tit. Ambros. l. de offi c. vlt. & venerab. Bed. in ca. 1. Luc.

And therefore the Roman Church hath most religiouslie ordained the lawe of perpetuall chastitie of Preists, for that altho' perhaps it may seeme more safe for some particular persons to marrie suppoſing their negligence & frayltie in that nature: & abstracting from a vowe alreadie made, & the lawe of the Church in that particular, yet althings cõsidered, & for as much as euen the most inclined to vice may liue chaste with Gods grace if they will make vse of his gifts, & of such meanes as the Church hath ordained for that end & purpose; it is to be iudged better, safer, & greater honour to God, that the whole state of Preisthood or Sacerdoce should be tyed with the sacred band of perpetuall chastitie. Neither doth all nor anie of the authors which the knight citeth absolutelie confesse the contrarie to be safer then this, but onelie (they being but three in number) one of them with a *perhaps* it were not worse, an other with an it were good, & holesome, & the third (who yet is no Romanist) with a may be thought necessarie, but showe their particular dictamens, & being so fewe as they bee, thou' they were the

Fatasse non esset peius sacerdotes quam plures vxorati quoniam multi saluarentur in Sacerdotio cõiugato qui in sterili presbyteratu damnãtur. Æneas Syl. l. 2 de gest. con. Basil. Cassander.

meanes onelie that Preists with ampliation, that is such persons as intend to be Preists may marrye if they fynde themselues not able to liue chaste: wher as the pretented reformers hould it lawfull not onelie for Preists but also euen for such religious persons as haue made a speciall vowe of perpetuall chastitie, to marrie at their pleasure, as the verie author & Antesignane of their sect did both in wordes & example teach them. By all which particulars it is manifest that Panormitans case is farre different frome the doctrine & practise of the moderne sectaries especiallie of the Church of England; & consequentlie his testimonie can not possible proue anie safetie for Sir Humfrey in this parte of his way, as being quite an other extrauagant way which neither meets with his nor ours. More ouer for conclusion I wish the reader to take notice that I neither fynde in Panormitan those formall wordes which Sir Humfrey cites, nor anie others intyrelie equiualent vnto them, nor yet are they intyrelie & continuatlie rehearsed by the knight but with interruption, as the authors owne wordes which here I truelie quote in the margen will declare. And besides this the faithlesse knight in steed of the wordes *non valentes* puts *non volentes*, & for the worde *credo* (which denotates the weakenesse of the authors dictamen, signifying therby that it was

Credo pro bono & salute animarũ quod esset salubre statutũ vt volentes continere, & magis mereri relinquere voluntati eorum: non valẽtes autem continere, possint contrahere quia experientia docente contrarium prorsus effectus sequitur ex illa lege cõtinẽtia. &c. Panor. 3. p. c. cũ olim de Cler. coniug.

was onelie a particular credulitie of his owne) he tranſlates, *it were good, & behouefull, & attributes the ſurmiſed Licentiouſneſſe of the Catholike clergie to the lawe of celibate it ſelfe*, whereas the author onelie ſaith. *ſequitur ex lege*, the contrarie effect followeth of the lawe.

And by occaſion of this paſſage, the reader may reflect what a pore ſhifte Sir Humfrey was forced to vſe for excuſe of the falacitie of his miſreformed miniſtrie when he catched at the authoritie of this one Apochryphal Cardinall, who neuertheleſſe vpon due examen appeares to haue ſo much fruſtate his ſiniſter expectation.

Now for Æneas Syluius, the doth leſſe fauore Sir Humfreys tenet, nay not at all, as his owne wordes aboue quoted in the margen doe manifeſt to the reader. He onelie ſpeaketh by a *perhaps it were not worſe that verie manie Preiſts had wiues*: & yet this he recalled of his owne accorde after his aſſuption to the cheefe Pontificall ſeat or Popedome, by a ſpeciall Bull of reuocation of that & ſome other immature poſitions vttered in his youth. So that the kinght was farre out of his way, when for the ſafetye of this parte of his new diuiſed way, he produced theſe authors, & if he haue no better garde & defenſe for it thē the teſtimonie of thē (as in truth he hath not) then ought euerie one to take heed of it, & auoide it as a moſt vnquoth, & perilous path.

greateſt Oracles in the world, they could not poſſible cauſe anie ſafetie in the conſciences of thoſe who ſhall followe them againſt the ſtreame of all other diuines, nor can they in any true ſenſe be ſayd to be the confeſſion of the Romaniſts as the knight doth affirme, ſince that two or three cannot in anie caſe carie the name of the whole nor iuſtelie preiudicate the weight of their authority in caſe they did agree with the miſreformed doctrine in this particular as yet they doe not.

And touching Panormitan whome Sir Humfrey calles a great Canoniſt I will not examen how great he was in that ſcience: yet I doe not ſee why his authoritie ſhould be accounted great in the Roman Church, ſuppoſing he was onelie a Sciſmaticall Cardinall of the ſciſmaticall Pope Felix. Secondlie ſuppoſe he were as great a Canoniſt as the author of the Canons himſelfe, yet doth his great authoritie fauore Sir Humfreyes cauſe neuer a iot in regarde he doth not affirme, as the latter parte of the 32. article of the English Creed doth, that it is lawfull alſo for Biſhops, Preiſts & Deacons, as for all other Chriſtian men to marrye at their owne diſcretion: But Panormitan onelie ſayde (to vſe his owne wordes) *I beleeued it were a holſome ſtatute for the good & health of ſoules) that theſe who will containe, & merit more may be left to their owne*

wills: but thoſe that ar not able to containe, may marrie. Becauſe experience teacheth that the quite contrarie effect followeth of that lawe of continencie. In which ſaying altho' I muſt needs confeſſe, he erred in preſuming to preſcribe a new rule to the Church, yet is it plaine he differs from the faith of Sir Humfrey in this point in diuers reſpects. Firſt in that he vttered not this as a matter either of faith, or yet of morall certaintie, but onelie deliuered it as his owne priuate opinion. How be it Sir Humfrey hearing the ſounde of the worde *Credo* (as it ſeemes) he preſentlie conceiued it to be as certaine as the Apoſtles Creed it ſelfe or at the leaſt deſired his reader might ſo apprehend it. Secondlie Panormitan doth not affirme abſolutelie that it is either holſome or yet as much as lawfull for Preiſts to marrie notobſtanding the precept of the Roman Church to the contrarie (as our noueliſts doe who alſo condemne that lawe of ſingle lyfe for iniuſte, & tirannicall) But he was onely of opinion that it were good for the health of the ſoules of ſome particular perſons, that the ſame Church ſhould alter her courſe, & make ſuch a ſtatute for the time to come. Thirdly Panormitan if his wordes be duelie ponderd, doth not affirme that the Church might doe well to conſtitute that Preiſts with the reſtriction of Sacerdoce or Preiſthood, I meane after they haue receiued orders, may marrie, but he

Certe quod ſacerdotibus interdictum fuit coniugium, id factum eſt impia tyrannide, &c. Cal. Inſt. l. 4. cap. 12. §. 23.

And ſo to conclude this I may not vnfitly ſay with Eraſmus: *qnæ malum eſt iſta tanta ſalacitas in noſtris uouis Euangeliſtis vt ſine vxoribus eſſe non poſſint?* what in the miſcheefe, ſaith Eraſmus, a great inclination to lecherie is this in our newe Euangeliſts that they can not be with out wiues? And I ſay further that if they perſuade themſelues they can not poſſible containe, & therfore muſt needs be marryed; at the leaſt why doe they reprehend Roman Preiſts who haue the contrarie perſuaſion, for obledging themſelues to a ſingle life? If they vpon ſuppoſition of ſuch carnall conceits hould they can not goe ſafe to Heauen without wiues at their heels, why ſhould thoſe be condemned who hould it ſafer to goe without them? *An oculus tuus nequam eſt quia ego bonus ſum?* wherefore doe the miniſters cenſure the Roman Preiſts ſo ſeuerlie for that which is a virtue in them? But in deed it is to be feared that thoſe who can not poſſible liue chaſtelie without a woman, will hardlie content themſelues with one in all caſes, but rather ſome times make bould with their neibours, or at the leaſt fall to that large axiome of leacherous Luther, *ſi non velit vxor, veniat ancilla*, in which I knowe not what ſafetie can be found for the ſoule, except Sir Humfrey houldeth that for the ſafeſt which is moſt agreable to the delights of the bodie.

where-

Wherefore if we will diſcourſe rather like men then blatter like beaſts, the onelie ſafetie that can be had in this matter, eſpeciallie for Preiſts, is to follow that *melius facit of S. Paule* 1. *Chorinth.* 7. I meane that ſtatute of a chaſte harte which there he mentioneth, and this ſtatute being once well & firmelie made, the *melius eſt nubere* hath no place, but then the ſpirituall mariage of the ſoule with Chriſt her ſponſe is made, & then it is to late to vſe that violent medicine; an other antidote muſt be vſed for the cure of that ſurfetting *Vri*, to wit mortification of the bodie, which medicine the ſame Apoſtle preſcribes in an other place ſaying, *caſtigo corpus meum*. And if the reformed miniſters would make vſe of this, then perhaps they would change their opinion & account the way of ſingle life ſafer then the way of mariage, & that way which as S. Hierome ſaith filleth Paradiſe, not that which filleth the world, & finallie that which S. Paule counſelleth abſolutelie, not that which hee onelie permitteth as a remedie for a ſuppoſed imperfection, which permiſſion tho' it be the eaſier way, & therefore perhaps is more willinglie imbraſed by Sir Humfrey in fauor of his deformed Clergie, as a man not ignorant of their imperfections in that nature, yet was the other euer commended as the ſafer way both by God & his Saints, & generallie imbra-

Contra Iouin.

ced by the Church an clergie before the daies of Luther.

Aboute prayer in an vnknowne language none of the authours the knight citeth, affirme that it is the safer way to pray in a vulgar tongue, or yet, that it is absolutelie better, but onelie *secundum quid*, that is for the edification of the Church as Caietan speaketh, yet not meaning but that is the best & safest all things considered which the Church doth practice: which practice as the same Caietan well kewe (as being a Cardinall of the Roman Church) is to haue the publike seruice in Latin rather then in the mother tongue for such reasons as I haue deliuered in an other place. And touching the testimonie of S. Thomas whome here the knight produceth in his commentarie vpon the 14. chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians (as I suppose, for he quotes not the place) as affirming it is manifest that he receiues more benefit who prayes & vnderstandes what he sayth, becausse the mynde of him who prayes & vnderstandes not, is without frute & refection. To this I anser, that S. Thomas doth not meane by this that it is better that the publike seruice of the Church be in a vulgar language which is that wee here haue in question, & not the priuate prayers of euery particular person, of which S. Thomas onelie speakes, as his owne wordes doe testifie

in

in that place which I haue exactelie read & duelie pondered. Euer ſuppoſing that manie things may be profitable for ſingle perſons which yet in cõmon are eſteemed much worſe yea and in ſome circumſtances abſolutelie ill, as by examples which paſſe in the lawes of temporall Republikes may plainelie appeare. That which S. Thomas did doubtleſſelie perſuade him ſelfe to be true whome the world knowes to haue dailie celebrated Maſſe in Latin not in anie vulgar language. To omit that euen thoſe ſimple people who praye in the Latin tongue altho' they want that particular inſtruction of the vnderſtanding which the learned receiue in prayer, yet ſans doubt they often tymes performe that action with greater deuotion & feruor in their wills & affections then the greateſt ſchollers in the world: God almightie by reaſon of their pious & humble deſires ſupplying as it were in one power that which wantes in an other.

And the ſame I ſay to the wordes of Lyra & Caietan who ſpeeches to the ſame purpoſe which S. Thomas doth & vpon the ſame place of the Apoſtle 1. Cor. 14. where altho' Caietan extendes his ſpeeh euen to publike prayer of the Church: yet is it manifeſt that the ſame Caietan doth neither condemne the contrarie practiſe of the Roman Church, nor yet houldes it abſolutelie better or ſafer that publike prayers

ers were (eſpeciallie in theſe our tymes) not in Latin but in the vulgar language. But he onelie meaneth that it were better in that one reſpect of edifying the Church if other circumſtances did alſo in like paritie concurre, or if there were not more prepondering reaſons for the preſent practiſe of the Church. And therefore Caietan preſentlie after the wordes cited by Sir Humfrey adderh others which if they had not ben omitted by him, they had quite cleared this difficultie, for ſo he proceedeth ſaying. *Et ne intelligeres reprehendi a Paulo eiuſmodi diuinas laudes* (to wit ſuch prayers as are made in an vnknowne tongue) *ſubiungit: nam tu quidem bene gratias agis*: by which wordes it is plaine that Caietan was not of knight Humfrey opinion in this particular.

Laſtelie the Rhemes Teſtament cited by Sir Hũfrey vpon the ſame paſſage of S. Paule confeſſeth the ſame that S. Thomas ſayth of a particular mans priuate deuotion, that in deed it is not ſo fruetfull for inſtruction to him when he prayes in a ſtange longuage, as when he vnderſtandes his prayers, yet the authors of the note adde an other clauſe which if the kinght had proceeded like a freind, he ought not to haue omitted, to wit that the Apoſtle forbides not ſuch praying neither: confeſſing that ſuch a mans ſpirit, harte, & affection prayeth well towardes God tho' his mynde &

vn-

vnderstãding be not profited to instructiõ, as o-therwise it might be if he vnderstood the words: neither doth he appointe him to translate his prayer in to his vulgar tõgue &c. Thus the Rhemists, Which as the reader may easilie perceiue doth quite contradicte Sir Humfreys purpose, & the doctrine & practise of his Church.

Circa primum an oratio debeat vocaliter perficii —— *Tũc dicitur ad dubium quod oratio publica necessario est vocalis. Oportet enim quod talis oratio innotescat populo pro quo offertur.* Biel. in Can. lect. 62. f. 124.

Sir Humfrey also falsifyes Gabriel lect. 12. in Can. or at the he least he falsely & ignorantlie vnderstãds him, when in his owne 265. page he cytes him, affirming that he diliuereth there seuen reasons why vocall prayer should be vnderstanded by the people, For Biel teacheth not there in what language vocall pryer ought to bee, but onelie proueth that it must not be meerelie mentall but so vttered & pronounced as it may be knowne for such by the people, *vt innotescat populo*, which wordes doe not signifie (as the kinght falselie English them) may be vnderstood, but may come to the notice or hearing of the people in regarde it is vocall prayer in what language soeuer it bee, Hebrewe, Greke, or Latin. So that the reader may perceiue that this author is neither pertinently nor sincerelie produced by our aduersarie.

For the greater safatie of his reiecting the wiship of images he produces expresselie three onelie authors, two of which neuertheless are no Romanists, one of them being the dimi-

chri-

romaniſt Eraſmus, the other Caſſander neither of whoſe authorities we admit for current. It is true the ſame Caſsāder brings out of Biel ſomething to the ſame purpoſe, who ſuppoſing he be truelie alledged, yet it muſt alwayes be true that one ſuallowe makes not ſummer, & ſo what ſoeuer he ſayth his authoritie alone can not ingender ſafetie. And ſince I writ this by taking a viewe of the authors themſelues, I fynde that Sir Humfrey hath thryſe corrupted Caſſander by omiſſion of ſome of his wordes which he rehearſes out of the 979. page of his conſultation of images: for all that clauſe of Caſſander: *imaginum moderato vſu pacis & tranquillitatis cauſa: couſeruato:* Sir Humfrey lets quyte drop out of his pen, which wordes not withſtanding are of ſo much importance to haue ben trulie related that togither with ſome others in the ſame page (which he alſo pretermits) they be the onelie wordes which moſt declare the authors meaning touching the honor due to images. The wordes are theſe. *Non tamen hæc quæ diximus eo pertinent vt imagines ſanctorum ſi in ijs modo decorum ſeruetur non aliquo honore illis conuenienti, & debito affici poſsint, videlicet ſi vt ſigna & monumenta ſanctorum honorifice habeantur & in gratiam illorum quos ſignificant & referunt, reuerenter conſpiciantur & tractentur, modo ab eximio cultu temperetur, & nihil diuinitatis & virtutis illis*

tribuatur, ſed eo tantum loco habeantur quo litteræ & voces quærerum abſentium quas diligimus & veneramur gratam memoriam ſuggerant. All which long ſentence as being much diſagreeable to Sir Humfreys Preciſian ſpirit he made shifte to paſſe ouer in lurchers ſylence. And in deed in my iudgement the foreſayd wordes taken as they ſtand in the text, are ſo plaine for the worship of images in that ſenſe in which the Roman Church houldes it lawfull to honore them, that I can not eaſilie preceiue in what they differ from the tenor of the decree of the Tridentine Councell in that point.

In the other place Sir Humfrey likewiſe omits the latter parte of Biels ſentence as it is cyted by Caſſander, & as the wordes are founde in Biel himſelfe, the wordes which Sir Humfrey ſcips are theſe, *quia qualitercumque conſideretur imago eſt res quædam inſenſibilis & creatura cui adoratio latriæ minime exhibenda.* Which wordes in deed are thoſe by which both Biel & Caſſander cheefelie declare what they denie to be lawfull in the due worship of images that is adoration of Latria or diuine honor: And yet both of them graunte an other inferior worship or honor due to them, ſo that the induſtrious knight to ſaue labor falſifies theſe two authors both at once. And altho Biel doth reprehend & that moſt iuſtelie, the blockish error of ſome ignorant people (of whichperhapsſome there may be ſome times in

the vniuerſall Church) that beleeue ſome diuine virtue or ſanctitie to reſide in images, yea & in one more then an other, & the like ſotish conceites, yet doth it not followe out of this reprehenſion of Biel that he denied it abſolutelie to be lawfull to worship images in due manner, as our captious knight would haue it: Nay Biel is ſo farre from this that in the verie ſame place quoted by Sir Humfrey he expreſſelie defēdes adoration of the images of Chriſt euen with Latria improperlie or per accidens, which is as much as anie Roman diuine graunts to anie image what ſoeuer. To which we may adde that the ſame Biel doth in expreſſe termes put for *concluſion* of his 59. lection theſe wordes, *Hæc de imaginum adoratione ratione repreſentationis*. This of the adoration of images in reſpect of their repreſentation. By which wordes it is cleare that is author this groſſelie abuſed in that he is cited by our aduerſarie againſt honor of images, he being ſo plaine a defendant of the ſame that he doubts not to vſe the words *Latria* & *adoratio*.

Eraſmus & Caſſander are alſo here produced by our aduerſarie againſt the vſe of images practiſed in the Roman Church. But theſe two altho' I doubte not but both of them in their writings incline much more to Catholike Religion then they doe to Proteſtancie: yet abſolutelie they are but neutrals who followed

more their owne wandering wits then anie other certaine rule of faith. And ſo their teſtimonies are not admitted by vs for Orthodox and authenticall. And therefore Sir Humfrey committes an error as often as he vſeth them for Romaniſts.

Againſt the ſafetie of inuocation of Saints he produceth S. Auguſtin ſaying. *Tutius & iucundius loquor ad meum Ieſum.* But this ſentence he cites he knowes not where, and it proues he knowes not what, nor I neither. S. Auguſtin truelie affirmeth that he ſpeaketh more ſafelie & delighfully to Ieſus thē anie other, & ſo doe I, but as hee doth not ſay that he ſpeaketh not to his Saints alſo, no more doe I. And as Saint Aug. tract. 84. in Io. ſayth that wee make commemoration of the Saints at the table that is at the altar, to the end they may pray for vs, ſo doe I. the knight citeth alſo for his purpoſe Chemniſius & Caſſander, but I care not for them, their teſtimonie is neither ſafe nor ſound.

Tract. 84. in Ioan.

Againſt the ſaftie of the doctrine of merits he citeth alſo S. Bernard ſaying that, *dāgerous is the habitatiō of thoſe that truſt in their owne merits.* But here the knight rides beſide the ſaddle, for S. Bernard ſpeakes not directlie of merits but of cōfidence in merits, which we Romaniſts graūt to be *vnſafe* by reaſon of the vncertaintie of them in this or that particular man. In an other

place

place the ſame S. Ber. ſayth he duelleth in the woundes of our Sauiour with more ſaftie: which ſaying we graunte alſo to be true in the higheſt degree, but what is this to the denyall of true merits grounded in the mercie & grace of God? of which the ſame *S. Bernard* ſayth in an other place, indeuore, or procure to haue merits, but when thou haſt them acknowledge that thou haſt them giuen thee. *merita habere cura, habita data noueris*. And the trueth is that by reiecting the counſell of holie S. Bernard in this particular, the reformers commit a moſt pernicious errour in regarde that by houlding all merit of man with God impoſſible, they come to neglect the exerciſe of virtue & thoſe good workes in which both merit doth conſiſte, & without which the Kingdome of Heauen is not obtained, which doctrine howe domageable it is to the Saluation of ſoules let the indifferent reader conſider.

Sir Hũfrey cytes alſo frayer walden whome he moſt *falſelie* affirmeth to agree with the Proteſtants in the doctrine of merits. For as appeareth by thoſe ſame wordes which he citeth here, he doth not denie all merit, as they doe, but at the moſt ſuch a kynde of merit in particularie: that is, that no man *ſimpliciter*, ſimplie meriteth the Kingdome of Heauen, which merit yet he doth not abſolutelie denie, but onelie ſayth that no man can merit it but

by the grace of God or will of the giuer, which are his owne expresse wordes as they are rehearse by our aduersarie, and in a sounde sense doe not differ a iot from the doctrine of other diuines. In fine he doth with the rest of the Catholike diuines *expresselie teach* that the good workes of the iust performed by the grace of God are absolutelie meritorious of the Kingdome of Heauē, yet he is opiniō that the words *ex condigno & congruo*, are not to be vsed; in which he differeth in deed from the opinion of moste diuines, but not from the Roman faith which standes not vpon those termes, but onelie vpon true merit, as may be seene in the Councell of Trent. sess. 6. Can. penult. p. 48. Which Councell vseth not those tearmes, but onelie the wordes *vere mereri*, that is to merit truelie. And consequentlie fryer walden agrees with the Councel of Trent but not with Sir Humfrey and his precise brothers who flie the verie name of merit, as deuils flie the Crosse. And to descend, to a more particular discussion of fryer waldos meaning touching the doctrine of merits of which the knight subtillie contendes to make him a flat denyer.

I say *in primis*, waldo in the place cyted by Sir Humfrey disputes against Wiclef, who thought such confidence in proper merits that he seemed to exclude the merits of Christ, & his saints. And therefore speaking of his perue-

uerſe tenet he ſayth thus. *Maledicta ergo doctrina Wiclef quæ potius confidere iubet in merito, & hoc proprio, vt Chriſti, & Sanctorum videatur excludere, quam in oratione humili pro Chriſti gratia.* That is: *Maledicted or curſed be the doctrine of Wiclef which rather commaundes to confide in merit, & that proper, ſo that it may ſeeme to exclude the merits of Chriſt, & his Saints: then in humble prayer for the grace of Chriſt:* Now this Kynde of confidence in merits, as our aduerſaries themſelues can witneſſe if they pleaſe, is not anie parte of the Roman doctrine, but rather we Romaniſts concurre with fryer waldo in his approued curſſe. Yea & we are ſo remote & auerted from the doctrine of Wiclef in this point, & from teaching ſuch confidence euen in true & approued merits, that we canteloufly aduiſe the members of our Church as the ſafer way not to relie vpon them but vpon the mercie of God as in an other place I haue more largelie declared.

More hauing moſt attẽtiuelie read his ſeueral treatiſes vpon that ſubiect, I plainelie perceiue that religious, & zealous defender of the Roman doctrine againſt Wiclef, did onelie reiect ſuch merits as either excludes, or at a the leaſt preferres not the grace of God before them, or admits not grace as the foundation of merits. For touching merits founded, & perfo med by the concourſe of Gods grace, fryer waldo abſolu relie

ſolutelie grauntes both in this ſame chapter cited by our aduerſarie, where he mentiones both the merits of Chriſt & his ſaints & particularlie of Sainct Paule in theſe wordes. *Whence it is that neyther the Apoſtle did applie anie thing to his owne merits but by premitting or preferring the benefits of God, according to the pſalmiſt ſaying. Becauſe he would ſo haue me.* As alſo more clearelie in his tenth Title & 98. chapter where he moſt profeſſedlie defendes againſt Wiclef, the verie participation of merits eſpeciallie among religious perſons. Which doctrine of participation of merits neceſſarilie ſuppoſes a graunt of merits themſelues, as common ſenſe doth eaſilie apprehend. Not to let paſſe, that ſome of the authours owne wordes in that ſame place, euidentlie conuince the ſame to be true: For that thus he queſtiones his aduerſarie. *cur merita non ijs partimur quos reddimus bene meritos noſtris meritis?* *Why doe not we parte merits with them whome we make well merited by our merits?* By which wordes Waldenſis appeares to be ſo cleare from denial of merits maintained by the Roman Church, that he rather heapeth merits vpon merits in defenſe of the ſame. And in the 8. chapter of his firſt Title he ſpeakes moſt expreſſelie euen of merit of eternall life ſaying. *Sed nouerint vitam æternam dari nobis pro meritis ſi cum meritis ipſis numeremus & gratiam ſine qua nec ipſa*

ſunt

ſunt merita, quia nec Dei dona. But let them knowe (ſayth walden) *that eternal life is giuen vs for merits, if with merits we number grace, without which neyther are they merits, becauſe they are not the giftes of God.*

And by this it further appeares moſt manifeſtly that thoſe wordes of waldenſis alledged by Sir Humfrey & with which he makes his florish, to wit. I repute him the ſounder diuine, & more conſonant to ſacred ſcriptures who ſimply denyes ſuch merit: in reallitie ar not for his purpoſe, in regarde that ther is not in them anie denyal of that merit which the Romã Church defines & appooues: no not the merit of eternal life: but the author of them, onelie reiects from the deſert of eternal life *tale meritum*, that is merit as it is ſignified by thoſe tearmes *de condigno*, And, *de congruo*, vſed among diuines both in his time, & at this preſent: from the vſe of which according to his priuate dictamen, it were more conformable both to diuinitie, & the ſcripture to refraine, to the end (as he after addes) they might by the auoyding of thoſe termes, be founde both to accorde better with the former ſaints (he meanes the ancient Fathers of the Church) & with the phraſe of the Apoſtle ſaying: *ſufficientia noſtra ex Deo eſt: our ſufficiencie is of God.* As alſo for that in reſpect of the grace of God, they might be founde more

1 Cor. 3. 5.

diſa-

Qui gratiã Dei, vel tacent vel abnegãt, & in meritis hominum omnino cõfidunt. Ibid.

disagreable (as in their doctrine so in their manner of speech) from the Pelagians, & wiclefists who (as the same walden saith) either conceile or denie the grace of God, & wholely confide in the merits of men: so you see that all the controuersie which fryer walden hath with our Roman deuines is onelie a boute the vse of those two phrases: *meritum de condigno*, and, *meritum de congruo*: as persuading the foresaid diuines that when they dispute of merits, they neuer silence the grace of God, but either expresse grace & not merits: or else preferre grace before meritis: and as he saies in Latin, *exprimentes gratiam, silentes de meritis, aut gratiam meritis præferentes*. All which is but *quæstio de nomine*: a nominal or verbal disputation, or aboute what manner of speech may seeme most fit to be practised in this point for a voyding offense in the heares: yet walden & those same diuines vniformelie according in the substance of the doctrine of merits themselues as I haue said once before. And so now let this be sufficient to declare vnto the reader how farre out of square our Crosse aduersarie hath detorted the true sense of this religious diuine, to make him seeme to teache according to his owne newe diuinitie in the matter of merits. I confesse I haue inlarged my selfe much more then the matter requires: if otherwise I had not considered how much it importes in all occasions

occaſions to daunte the audaciouſnes of a preſumptuous aduerſarie, who by making moſt plauſible vſe of that is leaſt for his purpoſe maintaines the ſmale reputation of his owne newfashioned religion cheefelie by the ruines of other mens honor: not ſparing this his owne renowned contriman indeuoring by indirect meanes to make him ſpeak againſt his owne faith & conſcience among the reſt: of which I could not poſſiblie be inſenſible: but was obliged euen according to the rules of natural affection, to labore to cleare him of ſuch a foule & iniurious aſpertion.

But now I come to a concluſion, where yet the reader if he pleaſe may further take notice of ſome other more triuiall abuſe offered to this ſame famous diuine by the ſliperie knight by leauing out the aduerbe *igitur* in his tranſlation of the Latin in to English, which in reaſon he ought not to haue omitted in regarde it neceſſarilie implyes a relation or reference to the authors former diſcourſe in which he argues againſt merit without mention of grace, & of which he ſpeakes in his ſubſequent wordes, *tale meritum &c.* alledged by Sir Humfrey in a cõtrarie ſenſe to his meaning. Beſides this, the ſame Sir Humfrey hath not a little tranſpoſed ſome of waldens wordes in his recital of them in English. Connecting to theſe; *or will of the giuer: thoſe, as*

all

all the former ſants, (vntill the late ſchoolemen) & the vniuerſal Church hath written. Which neuertheleſſe, he ought to haue ſet immediatelie after thoſe other which followe in the authors text: to wit; *inuenirentur eſſe diſcordes:* they might be founde diſagreable. But becauſe in deed I doe not perceiue it could much importe our aduerſarie to proceed in this manner; therefore I charitablie perſuade my ſelf it was not done of malice, but rather of ill cuſtome.

Laſtelie Sir Humfrey produceth Bellarmin for the ſafety of his way in this ſame point. But he that should haue read his fift booke of Iuſtification, would iudge that man fitter for Bedlam or Bridwell then for the ſchoole of diuinie, that would offer to cite Bellarmin againſt the doctrine of merits. The wordes & meaning of him I haue declared in an other place & ſo hould it in diuers reſpects ſuperfluous to repeate them. He cites alſo S. Auſtin out of chemnitius as it ſeemes, as ſaying (I knowe not where for he quoteth not the place) that he ſpeakes more ſafelie to *Ieſus, tutius & iucundius loquor ad meum Ieſum*. But what is this to the purpoſe of denying inuocation of Saints. For beſides that this comes onelie out of a iuglers bugget & ſo may iuſtelie be ſupected for falſe wares, yet admit S. Auſtin ſayth ſo, what Romaniſt is there who doth not ſay the ſame

yea

yea & practiſe the ſame daylie in their prayers? While they acknowledge with all ſubmiſſion & humilitie that all their ſaftetie & conforte of conſcience proceedes from Ieſus as the fountaine of their Saluation, as the concluſion of all or moſt Catholike prayers demonſtrate: Yet not ſo but that they may crye alſo vnto his freindes & ſeruants as being more neare allyed vnto him both in place, fauour, & merits then we our ſelues, that they interced & mediate for vs for the obtaining of that which wee our ſelues are not worthy either to obtaine or craue at his hãds. Which kinde of inuocation of Saints, S. Auſtin himſelfe doth approue in diuers places as tract. 84. in Io. Ser. de verb. Apoſt. & de cura pro mart. cap. 4. And ſo theſe being all the authors which Sir Humfrey hath produced in this ſection, I will conclude the cenſure of it in this manner. That whereas he promiſed in the begining to shewe the greater ſaftie of the Proteſtant faith then of the Roman by the confeſſion of the Romaniſts themſelues, he hath shewed no ſaftie at all, but onelie trifled in the wordes & meaning of his aduerſaries doctrine, & that onely in ſome fewe negatiue articles of his faith omitting all the reſt, & ſo he hath performed iuſt nothing which may ſerue for the demonſtration of anie way at all, & much leſſe of a ſafe & perfect way, but onelie hath brought him ſelſe & his reader fur-

further into the laberinth of his wandering wits.

The XI. Period.

IN his 12. ſection Sir Humfrey tells his reader that the Church of Rome doth ſeeke to elude the recordes, & reall proofes in the Fathers, & other learned authours, touching the cheefe points in controuerſies betwixt vs. This accuſation no doubt maketh a foule noiſe in a pulpit, but let vs ſee how the knight will be able to iuſtifie it.

For his firſt witneſſe he produceth S. Chryſoſtome *Hom 49. operis imperf.* where it is ſayd that, *the Church is knowne onelie by the ſcriptures.* But firſt the verie title of the treatiſe showeth this teſtimonie to be of ſmale authoritie as being *opus imperfectum* an vnperfect worke, & ſo it ought not in reaſon to be admitted for a ſufficient proofe: eſpeciallie conſidering that Sir Humfrey alledgeth no other witneſſe; & yet on the contrarie wee knowe that our Sauiour ſayd. *In ore duorum, aut trium teſtium ſtet omne verbum, in the mouth of two or three witneſſes euerie worde may ſtand.* And ſo ſuppoſe it were true that S. Chryſoſtome ſayd iuſt that which Sir Humfrey would haue him, yet is not one teſtimony enuffe to conuince an aduerſary, thus much I ſay for as much as concerneth the

point

point of controuerſie it ſelfe of the all ſufficiencie of ſcripture. But becauſe the knight may ſay this is not that which he intendeth directlie in this place but onelie to conuince that Bellarmin hath eluded the foreſayd teſtimonie, therefore I anſwere ſecondlie that Sir Humfrey needed not to haue gone to Bellarmin's Chronologie for the cenſure of the foreſaid worke, for he might haue founde it more plainelie cenſured before in his controuerſies, as appeareth *lib. 4. de verbo Dei non ſcripto*, the 11. chapter. Where the Cardinall hath theſe wordes. *But this teſtimonie is not of Chryſoſtome but of the author of the imperfect, who was either an Arian or certainlie his booke was corrupted by the Arians in manie places*: Thus Bellarmin. Shewing the corruptions by two ſeuerall inſtances taken out of the worke it ſelfe, where he ſpeaketh againſt the Homouſians that is againſt the Chriſtians of the Catholike Church to which he giueth that name becauſe they defended & beleeued the conſubſtantialitie of the eternall ſonne with his Father, & yet its well knowne that ſainct Chryſoſtome neuer eyther writ or ſpoake againſt the Homouſians as being one of them himſelfe & a profeſſed enimie to their aduerſaries the Arians.

And hence it is plaine that Bellarmin had reaſon to cenſure that worke & not to acknowledge

nowledge it for S. Chryſoſtomes, as Sir Humfrey would haue it, except he would haue condemned that glorious Doctour of the Church for an Arian heretike, as the reformed brothers muſt of neceſſarie conſequence doe if they will haue him to be the authour of that vnperfect treatiſe. Neyther did yet Bellarmin taxe it for that ſentence which the knight alledgeth out of it as hee craftilie & falſelie inſinuates, but for other erroneous doctrine which it containeth, which is no more contrarie to anie article of the Roman faith, if it be trulie vnderſtood: then it is to the faith of the reformers, except perhaps they be nearer in ſome points of their doctrine to the Arians then the Romaniſts bee, whoe quite deteſte & abhorre the ſame. Which I leaue to their owne conſciences to determin. For altho' the Romaniſts denie that the ſole ſcripture & pure text of the bible is ſufficient to determin all controuerſies & doubts in doctrine or mãners, yet they doe not denie but that the ſole ſcripture doth ſufficientlie declare the moſt & greateſt parte of the doctrine neceſſarie to ſaluation, & particularlie they graunt that the true Church may be ſufficientlie knowne by onelie ſcripture truelie expounded, which is the verie ſame that the authour of the imperfect affirmeth in the foreſayd wordes. Neyther is it all one to affirme that the Church is knowne onelie by ſcriptures & to affirme that the ſcrip-

pture onelie hath all ſufficiencie as Sir Humfrey doth falſelie ſuppoſe when he vſeth the firſt propoſition taken out of the author of the Imperfect as a medium to proue the ſecond which is his owne poſition, becauſe to know the Church onelie is not all the doctrine which the ſcripture containeth as neceſſarie to ſaluation, but onelie a parte of the ſame, & ſo it is cleare that how true ſoeuer it be that the church is Knowne by ſcripture onelie, yet cāſit not be theꝛce inferred that all the doctrine of the Church neceſſarie to ſaluation is ſufficientlie knowne by onelie ſcripture except out of the pregnance of his wit & extranagant skill in logique, the knight can infetre an vniuerſall propoſitition out of a particular, which I know he can no more performe then he can extract by arte two oyſters out of one apple. And thus we ſee that Sir Humfrey hath not proued by the exception of Bellarmin againſt the foreſaid treatiſe, that either the Roman Church or Romaniſts haue eluded their recordes, or reall proofes of Fathers touching the queſtion of all ſufficiencie of ſcripture, for that the ſentence thence produced prouethno ſuch thing. And conſequentlie there was no neceſſitie that Bellarmin ſhould indeuour to infringe the authoritie of the whole worke for ſuch a teſtimonie drawne out of it as is not contratie to the Roman faith, neither can it with anie colour

lour be imagined that the Cardinall would euer haue layde his cenſure vpon the ſame if it had not ben faultie in greater matters.

Secondlie Sir Humfrey produceth ſaint Auguſtin touching the deniall of honour of Saints, where he ſayth that manie are tormented with the diuell who are worshipped by men on earth. And whereas Bellarmins anſwere; according to Sir Humfreys relation, is that peraduenture it is none of Auguſtins that ſentence, the honeſt knight as if Bellarmin were all the Romaniſts that euer writ or ſpoake, maketh a generall interrogatorie ſaying what ſay the Romaniſts to this? As if that which one onelie priuate man ſpeaketh in a priuate matter were to be accounted the voyce of all men of his profeſſion. And yet Bellarmin doth not onelie adde more in his anſere yea & much more to the purpoſe, which not withſtanding our braue Sir Sycophant very ſlylie omittes viz. that he could not finde thoſe wordes in S. Auguſtin, but alſo addeth three other principall anſeres to the ſame obiection. And ſo it appeareth that inſteed of proofe that Bellarmin eludeth the recordes of S. Auguſtin, the eluſorie knight eludes both Bellarmin & his reader egregiouſlie by deceitfullie omitting that which both iuſtified the Cardinalls proceeding, & alſo declared the true meaning of the place cited in

ſainct Auguſtins name.

Thirdly he taxeth Bellarmin & ſtapleton for ſaying that S. Auguſtin was deceiued, or committed a humane errour in his interpretation of thoſe wordes *ſuper hanc Petram*, cauſed by the diuerſitie of the Hebrewe, Grek & Latin tongue which either he was ignorant of or marked not. But I anſere firſt that what ſoeuer error S. Auguſtin might commit in this matter, certaine it is that it was onelie aboute the interpretation of thoſe wordes *Math. 16. thou art Peter, and vpon thisrocke will I build my Church* For touching Sainct Peters ſupreme authoritie in it ſelfe (which is that our irreligious aduerſarie intendes cheefelie to diminish in this occaſion) it is moſt apparent that S. Auguſtin ſtronglie maintaines it in his ſecond of Baptiſme cap. 1. ſaying. *Quis neſciat illum Apoſtolatus Petri principatum, cuilibet Epiſcopatui eſſe præferendum?* That is who can be ignorat that Principalitie or ſoueraintie of Peters Apoſtolate is to be preferred before anie Epiſcopate or Bishoprike? And in his 15. ſermon of the ſaints, he ſpeakes yet more plaine to this purpoſe, affirming that our ſauiour did nominate S. Peter for the foundation of the Church, *& ideo digne fundamentum hoc Eccleſia colit, ſupra quod Eccleſiaſtici officij altitudo conſurgit*. And therefore (ſaith S. Auguſtin) the Church deſeruedlie ho-

honoreth this foundation vpon which the altitude of the Eccleſiaſtici ſtructure ariſeth. And by this S. Auguſtins ſaith of S. Peters ſoueraintie in the gouerment of the Church moſt clearilie appeares, ſo that no other peculiar opinion of his cõcerning the ſenſe of thoſe wordes *ſuper hanc Petram*, could poſſible preiudicate his owne conſtant doctrine in the ſubſtance of this matter in it ſelfe, as neither could ſtapleton or anie other Catholike diuine by their taxation of him.

And yet neither did S. Auguſtin in deed reproue the common opinion of diuines in expounding that place of S. Mathewe of the perſon of S. Petet: but expreſſelie remittes the choyſe of the one or the other to the iudgement, or affection of the reader, as is manifeſt by his owne wordes vpon this ſame ſubiect in his retractions concluding his diſcourſe aboute the two ſeuerall opinions in this manner. *Harum autem duarum ſententiarum quæ ſit probabilior eligat lector*. Of theſe two opinions let the reader make choiſe of which is more probable. And ſo this allegation is nothing to the purpoſe of Sir Humfreys malitious indeuors in prouing the euident teſtimonies of ancient Fathers to be eluded by Romaniſts, as being neither anie euident teſtimonie

Lib. 1. retract. c. 21.

[illegible]t ſelfe, as I haue declared, nor yet within the [illegible] of faith, or including the point of con-

[illegible]ſpher[illegible]

[illegible]trouerſie

troueršie in the matter propoſed by our aduerſarie in this paſſage, as he falſelie ſuppoſeth: out of which compaſſe euerie one may lawfullie abounde in his owne ſenſe: as well the Fathers in the deliuerie of their priuate opinions, as alſo the moderne diuines in paſſing their cenſures of the ſame as occaſion ſerues, So it be performed with diſcretion & modeſtie, as here it was by learned Stapleton, as his wordes doe shewe.

And beſides this, altho' we should admitte the foreſayd wordes of the Euangeliſt may diuerſelie be expounded either of our Sauiour or of ſainct Peter, or both: neuertheleſſe the Popes ſupremacie cannot ſuffer therby anie preiudice, as being ſufficientlie eſtabliſhed both by other wordes of the ſame paſſage, & by other places of ſcripture, particularlie by that of S. Iohn 21. *paſce oues meas &c.* Feede my sheepe. Which wordes are ſo forcible for the proofe of ſaint Peters ſupreme authoritie ouer all Chriſts flocke that they alone with the circumſtances of the text, were ſufficient to conuicte anie reaſonable perſons iudgement.

Thirdlie concerning the communion of the Cup he reprehendeth Bellarmin for ſaying in his anſwere to the wordes of S. Ignatius *one cup is diſtributed to all*, that in the latin bookes is not founde diſtributed to all, but for all. But firſt I ſay that why should Bellarmin be produ-

ced for an eluder of the Fathers recordes for telling the trueth? or for reporting that which he did see with his eyes, & perhaps without spectacles. And if it be founde by eye witnesses to be otherwise in the Latin copies then in the Greeke as truelie it is, as also it is founde that the Greeke copies are not sound in diuers other particulars in which they are discouered not to agree with the citations of S. Athanasius & Theodoret, What sinne did Bellarmin commit in vttering the same? But howsoeuer it bee good Sir Humfrey, doth Bellarmin relie onelie vpon that answer, nay doth he not giue two other more cheefe answers then that? both which you dissemble. And yet more then this, you haue shamefullie *corrupted that* one answere which you cite. For *Bellarmin* sayth not that S. Ignatius hath the wordes *distributed for all*, but, *one chalis of the whole Church*, *vnus calix totius Ecclesiæ*, meaning that there is one common chalice because it is offered to God for all. Nay besides this, Bellarmin yet further addeth, that the Magdeburgers read those wordes of S. Ignatius as the Romanists doe, of which also craftie Sir Humfrey taketh no notice: so that the reader may see that Bellarmin is here diuerslie abused by the false knight, & yet is he no more guiltie of eluding of the Fathers recordes in this particular then the foresayd Lutherans them selues, that is nothing at all.

Fourthlie

Fourthlie he taxeth *Sixtus Senenſis* for ſaying he ſuſpecteth Origen to haue ben corrupted by the heretikes where he ſayth: *Thus much be ſpoken of the typicall & ſymbolicall bodie*. But what if Senenſis vtter his opinion in that manner of that place of Origen. For doth not eyther he, or at the leaſt, a number of other diuines giue other ſolid anſers to the ſame as may be ſeene in *Bellarmin* & others. As that it is not certaine that workes is trulie Origens: & that thoſe wordes are not ſpoaken of the Euchariſt, but of the bread of the Cathecumes which we commonlie call holie bread, that Origen tearmes the bodie of Chriſt Sybolical & Typical becauſe it is preſent in the Sacrament as a type or ſigne of the ſame bodie of Chriſt as it is vnited to the diuine worde in the myſterie of the Incarnation in a viſible māner. For in that place Origen compares the bodie of Chriſt as it is in the Sacrament with the ſame as it is in it proper exiſtence.

And ſo in like manner ſanders and Baronius for diuers reaſons hould the wordes cited by Caluin out of the epiſtle of Epiphanius to Iohn of Hieruſalem touching the cutting of a vayle with an image of Chriſt, or ſome other man, which he founde at the entrance of a Church; for ſuppoſitious as being added after the whole epiſtle was ended. And yet notobſtanding, they relie not intirelie vpon this anſwere, but

yeald others alſo which, ſuppoſing the foreſayd addition were truelie the wordes of that holie Father, yet thoſe ſame authors abundantly cleare the difficultie & declare the trueth of his meaning in the controuerſie of honour of images. As alſo doth Valentia aboute the wordes of Theodoret touching tranſſubſtantiation, who ſayth that the ſubſtance of bread & wine ceaſed not in the Sacrament. To which both Valentia & other diuines, (notobſtanding they kewe by that which paſſed in the Councell of Epheſus, Theodoretus authoritie not to be great, or at the leaſt not to be ſo great as that hee alone could or ought to preponderate the reſt of the Fathers,) haue giuen other ſolide anſweres to his wordes beſides this which is related by the knight, as that he calleth the accidents of the Euchariſt by the name of the ſubſtãce of bread & wine attributing to the naturall properties of nature or ſubſtance, the name of nature or ſubſtance it ſelfe, as both the ſcriptures & other Fathers in the like occaſions vſe to doe, & particularlie *Gelaſius* whome the reformers vſe to cite againſt the trueth of tranſſubſtantiation, he onelie taking the worde ſubſtance (which is ambiguous & ſignifieth both the interior ſubſtance itſelfe, & the externall ſignes of the ſame) for the ſecond, not for the firſt: all which may be eaſilie perceiued by him who

Vid. Greg. de Val. l. 2. de tranſub. c. 7. & Suarez de Eucha. D. 46. ſec. 4.

Gelaſ. ep.

shall

shall read the authours them ſelues with attention & care. And as for Theodoretus, Iames Gordon in his fourth Controuerſie of tranſſubſtantiation noteth that if he be truelie tranſlated according to the force of the Greeke wordes, all difficultie touching his true meaning doth preſentlie ceaſe. And thus much for Theodoretus who is no way eluded by Valentia, but truelie & ſincerelie expounded.

As for Bellarmin whome when he anſwereth to the teſtimonie of S. Cyprian aboute traditiõs, the knight ſeemeth to taxe for attributing error vnto him. It is not true that Bellar. ſayth that he doth not maruell that S. Cypriã erred in reaſoning, as Sir Humfrey affirmeth, but the Cardinall onlie ſayth of S. Cyprian, *ideo non mirum ſi more errantium ratiocinaretur: therefore it was no maruell if he ſhould argue after the manner of thoſe that erre*, becauſe he writ that paſſage to which Bellarmin doth anſere in the place cited by the knight, when he defended his errour aboute rebaptization againſt S. Auguſtin. But withall Bellarmin addeth that S. Cyprian reiected not all traditions as the reformers commonlie doe, at the leaſt in faith & manners: but onelie he diſalowed that tradition in particular which S. Auguſtin alledged againſt his error, & onelie for that reaſon becauſe he conceiued it to be cotrarie to ſcriptures, which yet afterwardes appeared not to be ſo by the definition

finition of the Church not to be. So that Bellarmin is both here falselie accused to haue absolutelie affirmed S. Cyprian to haue erred in reasoning, & also it is false that his testimonie touching traditiõs in generall is by him eluded, which is that Sir Humfrey ought to proue if he speakes according to his owne purpose in this place.

And not much vnlike to this is the same Bellarmin falselie accused by the knight to haue affirmed that S. Chrisostome exceeded the trueth when he sayd. It is better not to be present at the sacrifice then to be present, & not comunicate, for Bellarmin sayd not that saint Chrysostome exceeded the truth, but onelie that he spoake by excesse, *per excessum ita esse locutum*, or *amplificandi gratia*, as he sayth afterwardes, which is not to exceede the truth but to vse a tropicall speech by which the truethis as farre extended as may be possible within her boundes but no further. And more ouer Bellarmin addeth so much besides to this answere to Saint Chrysostomes wordes, as takes all difficultie quite away touching his meaning in the point of Priuate Masse.

Vide Bell. L.2. de Missa. cap. 10. § Porro Chrysost.

Neyther is Sir Hũfreys complainte against Bellarmin lesse vniuste, where he sayth, yet not specifiing aboute what matter, that the Cardinall affirmes Prudentius to playe the poet, for why should anie man be reprehended

for

for attributing to a Poet that which is proper to all thoſe of his profeſſion that is to ſpeake by way of fiction or to vſe poeticall licence. The trueth is I can finde no ſuch wordes of Bellarmin as Sir Humfrey citeth, but ſuppoſe he ſpeaketh in that manner of Prudentius, yet I hould it to be no greater an extenuation of his authoritie then it were an extenuation of Sir Humfreys honour to ſay he vſeth his weapons dexterouſlie or plaieth the Champion courageouſlie. But yet worſe then this doth Sir Humfrey deale with Bellarmin aboute his anſere to a certaine teſtimonie of Tertullian. For whereas he onelie ſayth that Tertullians authoritie is of no great accounte when he contradicts other Fathers, & when, as S. Hierome ſpeaketh, *he was no man of the Church*: the knight to ſaue labor, but not to ſaue his honeſtie, leaueth out that ſpeeche of S. Hierome & putteth the whole cenſure of Tertullian vpon Bellarmin onelie, notobſtanding it appeares plainelie that the greater parte of it is taken out of S. Hierome, & ſo conſequentlie if anie proofe or recorde were eluded in Tertullian, Sir Humfrey might more iuſtelie haue accuſed him, then the Cardinall. But it ſeemes the knight proceeded in this as thoſe that in caſes of reuenge either for want of wit, or vallour, ſtill ſtrike their next fellowe whether he be in faulte or no.

In

In concluſion Sir Humfrey had no reaſon to ſtand vpon Bellarmin's anſere to thoſe two authours, I meane Prudentius & Tertullian; for that neither of them in the places cited ſpeaketh of anie point of doctrine defined by the Church, but of other matters in which as it was free for them to ſpeake what they pleaſed, ſo was it alſo free for Bellarmin to anſere what he pleaſed, eſpeciallie ſuppoſing that Tertullian ſpeakes but doubtfullie in the matter for which he is taxed by the Cardinall, that is in the manner of Chriſts penetration of his mothers wombe: & if he held he was borne according to the courſe of nature, he contradicteth the reſt of the Fathers, in which caſe no one Father hath the credit of an abſolute teſtimonie amongeſt the Romaniſts, neyther can he or anie for him iuſtelie complaine if he be diſeſteemed in ſuch a caſe.

Now for the cenſure which Riuera giueth of Origen to wit that he was full of errours which the Church hath alwayes deteſted, it is ſo manifeſtlie true that no man that will not dogmatize with him can denie the ſame. And the truth is that the reformers make as little, yea & much leſſe account either of him or anie other ancient writers, then the Romaniſts doe, as the world knoweth, eſpecially when they finde them contrarie to their poſitions. And not of one, two, or three diſſenting from the reſt,

reſt, but euen of the torrent of their conſent of which ouer plaine teſtimonie is extant in Luther, Caluin Kemnitius, & Chamier. And yet for all this the knight could produce nothing in particular in which he could accuſe the Romaniſts to haue reiected the recordes of the foreſaid authours at the leaſt in matter of faith.

Vid. Luth. de capt. Babyl. c. 1. Calu. 4. Inſtit. c. 18 Kem. pag. 798. Cham. de deſcenſ. Chr. ad Inf.

As for S. Hierome whome Canus affirmeth to be no rule of faith. I would knowe what reformer will maintaine the contrarie? And if they hould him to be a rule of faith then adieu their all-ſufficiencie of ſcripture. Beſides Canus yealdes a pregnant reaſon why S. Hierome was not to be followed in that particular of which he ſpeakes in that place, to wit in the aſſignation of the Canon of the old teſtament, becauſe ſayth Canus he followed Ioſeph the Iewe, but S. Auſtin followed the Chriſtians in that point of doctrine: which reaſon of Canus Sir Humfrey ought not to haue omitted if he had dealt ſincerelie.

As impertinent as this alſo is the taxation of Bellarmins anſwere to Iuſtin, Ireneus, Epiphanius & Oecumenius who ſeeme to haue held that the diuells are not to be torméted with the paines of hell before the day of Iudgement. For this is ſo abſurde a poſition that I thinke fewe or none of the miſreformed Churches defend it, & ſo I ſee not why Bellarmin can iuſtelie be reprehended for ſaying that he ſeeth not how

the

the foresaid authours can be excused from error in that particular, for that the Cardinall onelie condemneth them in that which the reformers themselues according to reason & sounde doctrine ought to condemne also, & that in no question of Controuersie betweene vs & them, nor which can iustelie preiudice the foresayd Fathers authoritie in other matters, especially in which they all agree.

Lastelie sayth Sir Humfrey, we produce the vniforme consent of Fathers against the immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. To which Salmeron the Iesuit, quoth hee, answereth that, weake is the place which is drawne from authoritie. But first I aske of Sir Humfrey what he & his consorts haue to doe with the immaculate Conception? For that is no Controuersie of faith betwixt the Romanists & them, it is a question among some Romanists themselues, & lawfull for either side to make the best vse they can of the testimonies of Fathers either by imbracing them, or expounding thē in that particular point, as they finde them most aduantageous for the defence of their seuerall opiniōs so farre as the Church permits thē, & that without any disparishmēt to their authority in regarde their wordes are not so plaine, but that they may seeme to admit diuers expositions in that particular. And as for Salmerō he neither speaketh of the Fathers in generall

generall when all or moſt of them conſent in a matter of fayth, nor yet when they plainelie agree in anie other point of doctrine, but onely when they ſpeake doubtfullie or obſcurelie, & this I ſay vpon ſuppoſition the place of the foreſaid authour is truelie cited, which, in regarde I haue taken the knight ſo often tardie in that Kynde of proceeding, I may vnrashlie ſuſpected. And the truth is that hauing now viewed the place in the booke which is in the 51. Diſputation of Salmeron vpon the 5. to the Romãs. I finde that he ſpeakes not of the vniforme conſent of Fathers or Doctors, but onelie of a certaine great number of thẽ to which he oppoſeth an other as great, as he ſuppoſeth, yea & greater: & therefore he addes. *Quare ſi authorum numero decertare velint* (meaning the oppoſers of the immaculate conception of the Virgen) *procul dubio abſorbebuntur*. So that this author is abuſed iuſt as I did coniecture before I ſa his booke. And altho' I can not much commend Salmeron for anie great ingenioufneſſe in his application of the shepards ſentence, yet ſure I ame that if he applied it not verie aptelie, you Sir Humfrey applie it much worſe & more abſurdelie. And thus hauing nowe examined all the particnlars of this ſection & hauing founde nothing which proueth the authours intent, I will end my period yet noting by the way how vanelie Sir Humfrey

frey concludeth his discourse affirming his reader to haue heard the proofe of the Romish witnesses in the behalfe of the Protestant doctrine made good by the testimonies of the Fathers themselues; which notobstanding is all false & meere delusion, for that I haue made it clearelie appeare that neyther anie Romanist by him cited hath graunted that anie one of the Fathers doth teach anie point of Protestant doctrine, nor yet that they speake in those places here cited of the cheefe points of doctrine in Controuersie: but contrarilie it appeareth that they speake onelie either of other matters which little concerne the Catholike faith, or at the least they speake in an other sense then the reformers pretend: yea & that which is more remarkable, not with vniforme consent, but rather fewe or at the most two or three in one matter, in which manner of proceeding, what argument soeuer may be deduced from them, it is no more truhe to beiudged & called the testimonie of the Fathers absolutelie, then that may be called absolutely the testimony of the reformers in which neuertheless onelie some fewe of them yeald their testimonies, & yet that but in some particulars, & those no principall points of faith.

And as for this complaint which Sir Humfrey maketh so formallie of the elusion of the

proofes

proofes, & recordes of the Fathers, as also touching that which he in like manner frameth against the Roman Church for her prohibition, or censure of bookes, I wonder with what face he can reprehend that which he knoweth to be so much practized in his owne Church, in which there cannot the least pamphlet, or smalest volume come forth which if it doth but seeme to cõtradict anie parte or point of the English faith, or anie other point of Puritanimse, is not presentlie ceased vpon by a pack of Pursuiuants, & put to the tortor of the Consistoriall assemblie there to receiue sentence of condemnation, by virtue of which it seldome scapeth the flames of Vulcan. Of which in parte is witnesse Doctour Mountagues latelie published booke, which by reason it sauored a little of some points of Romanisme; by an expresse Apeale euen to Cesar himselfe, could not be saued from the seuere censure of the Puritan sinagoge. And particularlie touching the authoritie of ancient Fathers, if it were a faulte in the Romanists to call in questiõ some passages, or sentences of some of their writings where they iustelie suspect them to haue ben corrupted by heretikes: Surelie the sectaries of these tymes are much deeper plunged in this nature thẽ they are, in regarde that vnder the breight colour of reformation they doe not onelie vse to reprehend particular passages, but reiect

whole bookes, & that not onelie of the moſt ancient Fathers as appeareth in the Hierarchie of ſainct Denis, but alſo whole bookes of the ſcriptures themſelues, as is manifeſt in the bookes of the Machabies & others which they vtterlie renounce & condemne for Apochripha, not ſparing the booke of wiſdome it ſelfe, ſuch cruell patrons they are of ignorance, and, of want of diuine knowledge. Nay & now of late they are be come ſo preciſe in this their ſpirituall tyranie that in their laſt editions as I ame informed, they haue quite banished the foreſaid bookes of Machabies Tobie, Iudith, wiſdome Eccleſiaſticus out of their bible. To omit other bookes of leſſe moment which they haue eyther mangled or left quite out of their editions, as in the Inquiſitors Iudex may be ſeene. So that nowe the reader may plainelie perceiue that Sir Humfrey & his pure ſimmiſts, are ſo farre from excuſe for their importune complaint of the Romaniſts in this particular, that we may iuſtelie compare them to thoſe Phariſeis who could ſooner ſee a mote in their fellowes eye then a beame in their owne. And ſo here I leaue them all to be cenſured for hypocrites by Chriſt himſelfe, & paſſe to the next ſection.

THE

The XII. Period.

THis Period shall containe an other accusation of the Knight, in which he chargeth the Romanists with the crime of razing the recordes of the reformers, & clipping their owne authours tongues, by which, sayth he, they are conuinced of an ill cause, & cõscience. But how falselie the Romanists be accused by Sir Humfrey it plainelie appeares by the examen of witnesses which I will make presentlie: and in the meane time let but the reader reflect vpon that which hath hitherto ben sayd, & he will easilie perceiue that Sir Hũfrey himselfe is conuinced not onelie of a bad cause, & an ill conscience, but also of such grosse proceedings as is not able either to the partes or su credit of a Caualier. But now to particulars.

His first charge is layde vpon the inquisitors for blotting out a certaine note made in the margen of the Bible of Robertus Stephanus vpon the 4. chapter of the deuter. That God prohibiteth grauen images to be made. But what razing of recordes is this? Is a newe note made by some one, moderne, vnknowne authour not sutable to the true sense of the text, & in such an edition of the bible as cannot be of anie long standing, to be accounted one of your recordes? And if it be yours how came it

into the Bible what doth it there? hath not the Inquitor as much authoritie to put it out as ſome obſcure brother of yours had to put it in? the true meaning of the ſcripture neither in the place of that note, nor anie other is, that God did prohibit abſolutelie all grauen images (as one of the greateſt diuines you haue, doth ingenuouſlie confeſſe) but onelie he did forbid them to be made to the end to adore them as Gods, or at the leaſt to adore them with danger of idolatrie, and yet the foreſayd wiſe annotation maketh the ſcripture to forbid all grauen images abſolutelie. Wherefore its nothing but a falſe recorde ordayned to deceiue the reader by abuſing the true ſenſe of Gods worde, & ſo the Inquiſitor when he branded it with a *deleatur*, he did but execute iuſtice vpon a falſifier of the Kings letters, which in him neither argueth bad cauſe nor ill conſcience, but sheweth both of them to be in the authour of the counterfet recorde which he foyſted in to the ſacred bible. To omit that it being no note of anie Roman authour as it manifeſtlie sheweth it ſelfe not to be: yet the knight leap'd quite out of the quire when he cited it for a record of his owne, except he ſuppoſeth al the writings of the pretended reformed Doctors of what ſect ſoeuer they be, to be recordes for his Church againſt the Roman doctrine: which is both moſt ridiculous in itſelfe, nor yet

Daniel Chamierus Panſtrat. l. 21. de imag. c. 8. n. 1.

was anie ſuch razing of the reformers recordes euer intended eyther by the Inquiſitors, or by anie other cenſurer of bookes in the Church of Rome.

His ſecond charge is aboute a certaine gloſſe vpon Gratian, which gloſſe affirmeth (according to Sir Humfreyes relation) that the Preiſt cannot ſay ſignificatiuelie of the bread, *this is my bodie*, without telling a lye. This gloſſe (ſaith hee) is condemned by the inquiſitor to be blotted out. It is true the Inquiſitor did ſo, but what then? did he therefore doe it wit an ill conſcience, I denie the conſequence. And in your conſcience Sir Humfrey is it not an idle gloſſe indeed? Doe not your miniſters themſelues when they deliuer the communion call it the bodie & blood of Chriſt? And if the Preiſt lyeth when he ſayth ſo not of the bread (as the falſe gloſſe ſayth if ſo, it ſaith) but of that which is contained vnder the forme of bread, ſurelie your miniſters tell a farre greater lye when they ſay ſignificatiuelie of the bare bread, that it is the bodie of Chriſt, truelie & reallie, as Maſter Caluin affirmeth. And ſo I conclude this point, that Sir Humfrey had no reaſon at all to accuſe the Inquiſitor of an ill conſcience in razing onelie ſuch a recorde as is no leſſe repugnant to the doctrine of the reformed Churches, then to the Roman faith if anie matter of faith it were, which indeed it is not; Inſtit. l. 4. cap. 17.

& ſo by conſequence it is alſo impertinent to the matter here in queſtion.

Thirdlie Sir Humfrey chargeth the Inquiſitor for blotting out Caſſanders whole tract of the Cõmunion in both kynds. But what worſe conſcience sheweth the Inquiſitor in this fact then the Inquiſitors of the reformed Churches doe, who are not content with a ſimple *doleatur*, but daylie condemne whole Catholike volumes to the vnmercifull Vulcan. And as for the recordes which you take out of Caſſander we make no more accounte of them then we doe of thoſe which you take out of Luther or Caluin, & ſo you may take them & make your ſelfe merrie.

Fourthlie Caietans opinion that the wordes, *this is my bodie*, doe not ſufficientlie proue tranſubſtantiation, is no recorde for you, as you falſelie ſuppoſe, for he doth not denie tranſſubſtantiation as you doe, but expreſſelie defended it, as his owne wordes declare which I afterwardes recitie: nay he doth not affirme abſolutelie (as ſuarez wordes quoted by your ſelfe in your owne margent expreſſely declare) that the foreſaid wordes doe not ſufficientlie proue tranſſubſtantiation as you corruptedlie relate, but onelie ſayth at the moſt that, ſecluding the Churches authoritie, they doe not proue it: which, not as contrarie to faith, but as a ſingular, & extrauagant opinion of that

authour

authour, Pope Pius did (if perhaps he did) piouſlie blot it out, not preciſelie becauſe it fauoreth the reformers (as in trueth it doth not to anie purpoſe) but becauſe it ſm'at disfauored the truth, which is that tranſſubſtantiation is indeed plainelie enough contayned in thoſe wordes of Chriſt, *this is my bodie*. Howbeit I muſt needs aduertice the reader that I neyther finde thoſe wordes ſuppoſed to be Caietans, blotted in anie Index that I haue ſeene, nor yet can I finde them in anie edition of Caietan in the place cited by Suarez, that is vpon the 75. q. art. 1. But onelie theſe. *Conuerſio non habetur explicite in Euangelio*, & theſe: *Quod Euangelium non explicauit expreſſe, ab Eccleſia accepimus*. Nay more then this I finde other wordes in the ſame place which conuince that Caietan held tranſſubſtantiation to be ſufficientlie contained in thoſe wordes *this is my bodie*, for ſo he argues. *Sacramenta noua legis efficiunt quod ſignificant, ac per hoc verba Chriſti hoc eſt corpus meum quia efficiunt vtramque nouitatem ſcilicet conuerſionis & continentiæ (vt expreſſe dicta ſacri Concilij authoritas teſtatur) conſequens eſt vt eadem Chriſti verba ſignificent vtramque nouitatem*. Wherefore ſuppoſing Caietan ſaid not that the wordes: *this is my bodie*: conteine not ſufficientlie tranſſubſtantiation, but onelie not expreſſelie: I cannot conceiue what foundation Suarez might haue

for this his relation, except peraduenture Pius quintus founde that edition alone of Caietan to haue ben corrupted by heretikes, & therefore cauſed it to be corrected in that paſſage: as indeed an other place of the ſame Caietan 2. 2. q. 122. is diſcouered by the authors of the prohibitiue Index to haue ben in that ſame fashion fraudulentlie depraued, as the ſame Index expreſſelie teſtifies in theſe wordes quoted in the margen.

In Thomæ Caietani commentarijs in D. Tho. 2. 2. q. 122 art. 4. omnino corrigantur errores qui fraude hæreticorum irrepſerunt, vt notatur in expurg. Index lib. prohib p. 89. Geneu. impreſ.

The Epiſtle of Walricus is ſuppoſitious, which is paoued to be ſo becauſe it is ſuperſcribed to Pope Nicolas to whom according to the computation of times, the firſt Pope Nicolas was before Walricus was borne, and the ſecond Nicolas was not borne till after he was dead. Neither is it any way probable that ſuch a holie Bishop as Walricus was, should commend marriage in other Preiſts, who liued and dyed in vnmarried chaſtity himſelfe, and ſo the foreſayd Epiſtle being a falſe record, as containing an improbable yea a morally impoſſible relation, it was iuſtely condemned with a *deleatur*. To omit that if this Epiſtle wer authenticall, the reformers would gaine nothing by the bargen for that it teacheth expreſſely that the Roman Bishop is head of the Church, and that Preiſts at the leaſt after ordination cannot lawfully marrie.

Sixtly it is falſe that Bertram's whole booke is condemned, as may appeare by

the iudgement of the Vniuersitie of Doway approued by the Censurers of bookes inserted in the Index of Quiroya published by *Ioannes Pappus* a reformed deformed diuine with certaine odious prefaces of his owne coyning, & printed at Argentin 1609. In the 17. page of which Index it is manifest that the whole booke was not commaunded to be blotted out, but onely some few things to be corrected, or altered in the reading, or to be expounded benigneously. And as for the doctrine of transsubstantiation, the foresaid Doctours of Doway expressely declare that Bertram often times in the first parte of his disputation teaches Catholike transubstantiation plainely enuffe, vsing the words *conuertere, mutare, commutare, permutare transponere creaturam in Christum, in corpus Christi &c.* in so much that Illiricus compelled with the plainesse of those wordes, confesseth there are in Bertram *semina transsubstantiationis*, *seeds of transubstantiation*. And also the same Dowacene Doctors conclude that those difficult places which are founde in him touching the reall presence, which cheefely are two, to wit that he seemeth to haue ben of opinion that Christs bodie is no more in the Eucharist then the bodie of the people, and that that thing which is celebrated or done in the Church cānot be called God; are either to be vnderstood of the externall formes of bread and wine: or

els

els that those sentences be inserted by heretiks who printed that booke first at Colen. 1532. & after at Basil. 1550. & 1555. so that this is no recorde of the reformers, except it be vpon supposition of their owne corruptions or false glosses added vnto it; but rather may serue for a pregnant testimonie against them, and consequētly he that should haue blotted it out, had done them no iniurie but a verie great fauor.

Seuenthlie I say to the sentence taken out of the booke of baptizme vnder the name of Anselme, that manie passages be blotted out by the Censurers of bookes, by reason they are such as may easilie be taken in an erroneous sense, & so scandalize or giue occasion of errour either to the simple, or malicious reader, which neuertheless in a sounde sense containe no false doctrine, & so might be lefte vncorrected if it were not for the corruption & malignitie of the tyme. And of this nature be the wordes of the booke of the visitation of the sicke & Baptisme, if they be ritely recited by Sir Hum. *Doest thou beleeue that the Lord Iesus Christ dyed for our saluation, & that there is no meanes to be saued by our owne merits?* Which sentence in a true meaning is no recorde of the reformers, & in a false meaning, it is better blotted out thē lefte in. And such diligence argueth no ill conscience, but a motherlie care of the Church towardes here children.

8. We

8. We haue ſayd ſufficient alreadie touching the credit of Caſſander, whoſe doctrine the Romaniſts hould for falſe recordes either in parte or totalitie. And he maketh ſuch prepoſterous gloſſes vpon the Eccleſiaſticall himnes, as the Index noteth in one place, that all his whole *ſcholium* is repugnant to the ſame like a commentarie contrarie to the text. Yet to giue the reader a taſte What truelie this man was, who is ſo farre in Sir Humfreys bookes: I ſay that altho' we hold not Caſſander for a Romaniſt, as being in the Index of prohibited bookes for diuers ſingular poſitions, neuertheleſſe the knight cannot iuſtelie brag of him in regarde it is manifeſt by his workes which I haue ſeene & read in parte, that he expreſſelie defendes the Roman doctrine in moſt points of Cõtrouerſie betwixt vs & the Reformers: as alſo becauſe in a greater parte euen of the ſame places which Sir Hum. cites in his fauour, he is not a little abuſed & either corrupted or detorted by him cõtrarie to his meaning. Howbeit in reſpect he profeſſeth the parte of a Pacifer & mediator betwixt vs, he could not but leane ſome thing to their ſide, yet is it ſo little that I perceiue by one of his writings that he had ſmale thankes for his paines from ſome of the faction, & therefore was moſt sharpelie handled by them accuſing him of diſſimulation, impoſture, interruption

of

of the course of the Gospell & the like. An infortunate man who by his great labours & earnest endeuours to content both parties, contended neither: a iuste punishment due vnto such as destitute of true knowledge in diuinitie (which he himselfe in parte confesseth in his generall Preface) presume to treat of those sublime subiects sans a guide.

The Basilean edition of Polidor virgill printed in the yeare 1544. compared with other former & the most ancient editions is founde to haue ben corrupted by the sectaries & so no true recordes can be taken out of it for Sir Humfrey & his confraternitie. And such is that passage which the Inquisitours commanded to be blotted out, which is this. All most all ancient Fathers condemned images for feare of idolatrie. This sentence as false & foysted into the foresayd Basilian edition, is iustelie cast out as none of the authours doctrine, or at the least vehementlie suspected for none of his. And touching the doctrine of honour of images it selfe, it is cleare that he can aforde no recorde at all for the reformed diuinitie, for that he expresselie relateth the vse of images in Churches deduceing it historicallie from the most primatiue tymes. Langius or Langus is of no authoritie among the Romanists & so he yealdes no recordes of credit. And at the best he is but a pedanticall Annotator, & as I take

it a

a Lutheran, that is neither of Sir Humfreys religion nor of ours.

As for Ferus certaine it is that some of his editions haue ben founde to be mightilie corrupted particularlie that of Mogunce. Which the knight citeth & so the recordes drawne out of him are of no authoritie. But suppose Cephas did indeed not signifie the head, yet what great recorde I praye can that be for Sir Humfreys Church? And so whether Cephas signifie the head or the feet, & whether *ridiculum est* be in, or out of the bookes, it auayles him nothing but some smale matter to quarell aboute: yet the truth is that the most authenticall edition of Anwerpe 1585. hath the same wordes which Sir Humfreyes cites out of the Roman print: in such sorte as one may rather much more suspect those wordes, *it is ridiculous*: to be falselie added in the Mogun-tin edition then detracted in the others.

Finallie whether the wordes of the Councell of Laodicea be that wee ought not to leaue the Church of God & inuocate Angells, as Sir Humfrey will haue it, & also some Catholike copies haue: or whether in steed of the worde Angells wee reade angles or corners, as some other editions haue, the matter is not great so the decree be right vnderstood, that is so that the sense be this: we ought not to leaue the Church of God & inuocate Angells superstitiously

tiouſlie as ſome did in thoſe tymes. For this being the true meaning of the Councell as it appeareth by the ſubſequent wordes which are thoſe, *and make congregations of abominable idolatrie to the Angells*, it is more then plaine that no recorde can there be founde for the doctrine of the reformed Churches. But onelie it ſerues Sir Humfrey to make a plauſible florish to the ſimple reader, to the end that by working vpon his weakneſſe by falſelie taxing his aduerſaries, hee may make his owne impoſtures ſaleable, which otherwiſe would putrifie & ſpoile for want of vtterance.

Laſtelie for proofe of his accuſation, Sir Humfrey after all this ſturre he hath made, produceth onelie one witneſſe, & that a falſe one: and altho' for the greater credit of his cauſe, he held it expedient to giue him the degree of a diuinitie reader & profeſſor, & Deane of Louaine; yet hauing examined the matter, I founde by better information then Sir Humfrey can haue, that Boxhorne before his reuolte had onelie the place a certaine of obſcure Deanrie: which function altho' it be a place of ſome credit, yet it is farre inferious to the dignitie either of a Deane of a Capitall Church, or of a publike profeſſour of diuinitie in the vniuerſitie of Louaine, both in learning, honour, & profit. And yet this man as I receiued by authenticall relation of the Deane of

S. Gudula

S. Gudula Church in Bruſſels, & others: after ſome extraordinary familiarity which outof his ouer amorous nature he vſed to a domeſtike maide ſeruant of his owne, & out of an vnſetledneſſe of his lubrik mynde, began at firſt to defend that, it was not neceſſarie for the Preiſt to prononce the wordes of conſecration orally, but onelie to ſpeake them mentallie, & afterwardes (*as nemo repente fit malus*) by degrees falling into plaine hereſie, founde oportunitie to paſſe into the land of libertie, I meane into Holand, with bag & bagage, I meane with his Sacrilegious ſpouſe & the ſacred ſpoiles of his Church. Where from the place of a fugitiue Pedant, he is preferred to the dignitie of a new Euangeliſt, & is become a bloſtering trumpeter in the pulpits of the miſreformed congregations.

Boxorne once a petie-maſter.

And this is the onely man which Sir Humfrey could bring for a witneſſe againſt the practice of the Roman Church in her manner of cenſuring bookes or correcting the ſame, or approuing them according to the order & decree of the Councell of Trent, which collapſed Deane being ſo infamous in his lifeas by this which I haue ſpecified, and more which I could relate, doth appeare, and being alſo now a profeſſed enimy and Apoſtata from his mother Church, let the reader iudge whether in reaſon his teſtimony ought to be admitted againſt her:

and

and let him withall be pleaſed to conſider that Sir Humfrey in lue of conuincing his aduerſaries of ill conſcience, he hath by his owne bad proceeding in this ſection conuinced his owne to be the worſt of all, & ſo is falle into the ſame pit he prepared for his enimies *incidit in foueam quam fecit*, by forgeing of falſe recordes, & hath incurred a farre deeper dungeon of cēſure then hither to he did, in which he muſt remaine either till he hath payde a double fine, or put in ſuretie for the amendment of his manners.

The XIII. Period.

IN his fourteeneth ſection Sir Humfrey indeuoreth to conuince his aduerſaries of the defence of a deſperate cauſe by their blaſphemous exceptions, as he calleth them, againſt the ſcriptures, by which we ſee that as his booke increaſeth in number of leaues ſo he increaſeth in multiplication of his malicious and falſe accuſations, and theſe being the cardes he playeth with, let vs examen his gaime.

He continueth confidently his allegation of his falſe Deane of Louaine for a witneſſe againſt the Romaniſts, whoſe worde notwithſtanding ought not either in reaſon or according to the courſe of lawe to be admitted for recorde againſt thoſe from whoſe religion he hath reuolted. And ſo whereas he accuſeth the Roma

Church

Church of poyſon in religion & tiranny in the common welth, it is to be taken as proceeding from a poyſonous minde, which being once corrupted hateth the truth as much as an ill ſtomake loathes dainty meates.

As for the ſcriptures, it is falſe & ſlaunderous to affirme that the Romaniſts refuſe to be tryed by them ſo they be taken together with the authoritie of the Church which the ſame ſcriptures commende, as Saint Auguſtin ſpeaketh againſt his aduerſaries, and in a true ſenſe without which as one of the auncient Fathers ſaith, *verbum Dei male intellectum non eſt verbum Dei* that is, the worde of God ill vnderſtanded is not the word of God. And according to this not that ſacred Bible which was in the Apoſtles till the dayes of Luther without alteration, is as you calumniouſly affirme, ranked by the Inquiſitors *inter libros prohibitos*, among the prohibited bookes, but your execrated Bible I meane your execrable tranſlations and annotations, & mutilations of the moſt holy Bible, are thoſe that are regiſtred in the cenſure, where whether it haue, as you affirme, I knowe not certainely, but I am ſure it deſerueth the firſt place, becauſe as the Philoſopher ſaith *corruptio optimi peſſima*, and ſo as your Bible-corruption is in the higheſt degree of badneſſe, ſo ought it in reaſon to be ranked in the higheſt ſtation of ſuch falſe wares as that Catalogue condemnes.

Quamuis certum de ſcripturis non profe-ratur exẽplum tamẽ earundem ſcripturarũ à nobis tenetur veritas cum id facimus quod vniuerſa placet Eccleſia quam ipſarum ſcripturarum commẽdat authoritas. Aug. lib. 1, cõtra Creſ. c. 33.

And of the cenſure of your owne abuſes I graunt you may with ſhame enough to your ſelues be eye witneſſes, but if you meane you are eye witneſſes of the cenſure of the true ſcriptures it is moſt falſe & calumnious that either they, or the authours of them be called in queſtion: and yet more falſe & ſlaunderous it is that Chriſt and his Apoſtles are arraigned & condemned at the Popes aſſiſes (as you odiouſlie affirme) of obſcuritie & inſufficiencie in their Goſpell. For that neither Pope nor Prelate of the Roman Church euer vttered more of the ſacred ſcriptures in that nature thē that which S. Peter himſelfe affirmeth, to wit that in the epiſtles of S. Paule there are manie things hard to be vnderſtood, or that which S. Auguſtin ſaith in generall of the written worde. That is, *that certaine obſcure ſpeeches of the ſcripture bring a moſt denſe or thicke miſte vpon them. And that they are deceiued with many, & manifould obſcurities & ambiguities that rashly reade them, vnderſtanding one thing for an other.*

Bibliorum verſiones tam vet. quam noui Teſt. à dictis (damnatis) authoribus edita, generaliter prohibentur. Index ex Purgatorius. Regul. 3.

Lib. 2. de Doctr. Chriſt. c. 6.

And as for the Goſpell of Chriſt & his Apoſtles, neither the Pope nor anie other Romaniſt euer condemned it of anie inſufficiencie or defect, but onelie teach with the ſame ſcripture itſelfe that it doth not containe all things neceſſarie ſo explicitlie that they ſuffice for the inſtruction of the whole Church according to all ſtates of people & in all particulars without tradi-

traditions, as appeareth by the saying of sainct Paule *Therefore brethren stand & houlde the traditions which you haue learned whether it be by worde, or by our epistle*. Which wordes of the Apostle neither can truelie be verified nor his commaund obeyed, except we graunt that he deliuered more to the Church of the Thessalonians then he left in writing. Neither doe the Pope & Romanists anie more condemne the scriptures of insufficiencie by denying that they containe clearely all things necessarie, or by affirming that diuine & Apostolicall traditions are also necessarilie required, then the reformers them selues, who besides scripture professe at the least in wordes to beleeue the Apostolicall, nycene, & Athanasian Creed: not no more then that man should be thought to condemne the common lawes of insufficiencie who besides them iudgeth it also necessarie to obserue those ancient customes which the lawes themselues commend as by the legislators & first authours of the same deliuered to the people by worde of mouth. And so to conclude, touching the scriptures thus vnderstood, the Romanists are so farre from refusing to be tryed by them that they flye vnto them with sainct Chrysostome in all occasions as to most hight montaines in which they finde a most comodious place to plant their ordinance against the enimies of the faith, & particularlie 2. Thes. 2.

againſt the ſectaries of this our preſent age, as is moſt euident in the late Councell of Trent all the decrees of which renouned Synod are founded vpon thoſe heigh hills of the written worde of God according to the true ſenſe & meaning of the ſame. And as for Cauſabon & Agrippa whome the knight citeth, he & they may goe together for their authoritie viz. in lying. Agrippa & Cauſabon are alreadie regiſtred in the Predicament of Noueliſts, & althou' the knight as yet is not preferred to that honour, yet his deſerts are ſuch as he may iuſtelie expect the like aduauncement.

Vide Indicem lib. prohib.

You aske vs, Sir Humfrey, whether the worde of God is ſubiect to alteration or needeth & Index expurgatorious, but to this your wiſe demaunde I anſer, that the worde of God in itſelfe is wholelie immutable, ſo pure that it can need no purifying, yet as it is & expreſſed by artificiall caracters for the vſe of man, ſo it is not onelie mutable & corruptible, but alſo *de facto* it is & hath ben corrupted, witneſſe your owne Bibles in England. And witneſſe that renowned King Iames your owne ſoueraine & beſt defender of your faith, who was ſo ashamed of the tranſlations which he founde at his arriuall to the English Crowne, that he preſently ſought a remedy for the ſame (tho' he founde it not, as appeareth by his new tranſlation which yet is not as it ought to be)

publi-

publikelie declaring in the Conference of Hampton Courte, & ingenuouslie confessing that he had seene no true translation, & that the Geneua translation is the worst of all others. Anno Domini. 1624.

Neither ought the corruptions founde in the reformed Bibles to be called *peccadillos* or smale faultes as Sir Humfrey would haue them to the end they may be the more easilie winked at: for suppose they were neuer so little in themselues, yet are they to be esteemed great & horrible abuses in regarde of the great reuerence which ought to be had towardes those sacred volumes of the worde of God, it being treason in the highest degree to offer to falsifie or alter them anie way whatsoeuer. And let the reader be iudge whether it be but a smale faulte to translate *images* for *idols*, as the English bible of the yeare 1562. hath *in the text*: or as an other of the yeare 157[illegible]. hath in the margen vpon the first chapter of the Epistle of S. Iohn, in the last wordes. Or as the same, or other editions vpon the wordes of Iacob. Gen. 37. v. 35. *descendam ad filium meum lugens in infernum*, hath translated the worde *infernum*, *hell*, into the worde *Sepulcher*, or *graue*: notobstanding both the Hebrewe worde *Seol* & the Greeke worde *adis* signifie not the graue but either properlie heil it selfe, or some parte of the earth farre deeper then the graue. And in this

this manner Beza hath done vpon thoſe wordes of the pſalme. *non relinques animam meam in inferno*, tranſlating for *animam Cadauer* & for *inferno, ſepulchro*, & ſo Metamorphizeth Chriſts ſoule into his bodie, & hell into his graue. And vpn the 22. of ſainct Luke where according to the Greeke text, the ſentence is, *This is the cup of my blood which cuppe is shed for you*: Beza to eneruate the force of the argument for the reall preſence, purpoſelie tranſlateth the wordes thus. *This is the cup of my blood which blood is shed for you*. Alſo the English bibles, whereas ſainct Peter in the firſt chapter of his ſecond epiſtle v. 10. ſaith, *brethren labore the more that by good workes you make ſure your vocation & election*. Leaſt here it ſhould appeare that good workes are auayleable or neceſſarie to ſaluation, they leaue out in their tranſlations the wordes: *by good workes*, notobſtanding the Latin copies haue them vniuerſallie, & ſome Greeke copies alſo, as Beza confeſſeth. And if theſe be the faults which Sir Hũfrey calleth but *peccadillos*, ſurelie he hath a conſcience as large as a fryers ſleeue: & if theſe be his ſmale faults doubtleſſe according to due proportion his greater ſinnes are abomination. And this is that Bible which the Romaniſts ſay needeth an Index expurgatorie, not that Sacred Bible which is truelie & ſincerelie tranſlated according to that text which hath ben at the leaſt ſince the tyme of

S. Au-

S. Augustin commonlie vsed in the Church, as appeareth by the Rhemes Testamēt, which because it is founde to haue ben rightlie translated, is not arraigned by the Pope, but exposed to be read euen by the laitie, at the least by licence & aduise of their Confessors.

Further more in regarde of the foresayd corruptions & manie other which for breuitie I omitted, made by heretikes in the holie scriptures, those moderne authours which Sir Humfrey citeth (if they be trulie cited) haue ben induced to vtter some such speeches concerning the same as, if they be not truelie & piouslie interpreted, may giue occasion of offence to the reader: for example when they affirme (as he sayth) the scriptures to be dead caracters, a dead, & killing letter &c. such phrases nuertheless (as it manifestlie appeareth by the rest of their doctrine & discourse in those places) are not vsed by those authours with an intent in anie sorte to disgrace or diminish the dignitie of the true worde of God, but onelie by those comparatiue speaches, to declare how subiect the scriptures are to be corrupted & detorted to the defence of heresies & errours if they be considered preciselie as they are the externall written letter, & interpreted otherwise then by the authoritie of the visible Church in all ages, the ancient Councells, & Fathers, they haue ben vnderstood. Wherefore those Ro-

manists which the knight citeth as if they had spoken irreuerentlie & blasphemonlie of the holie scriptures doe no more iniurie vnto them then S. Paule did when 2. Cor. 3. he sayth of them, *litera occidit*, the letter killeth, or then did S. Hilarie when he teacheth that manie heresies haue their origin from scriptures ill vnderstood, or then Martin Luther who called the Bible *liber hæreticorum* the booke of heretikes. None of which speeches as I suppose Sir Humfrey will dare to condemne either of blasphemie or irreuerence, nay if he haue his senses aboute him he will easilie perceiue that those & other such like phrases are not meant actiuelie of the worde of God, but onelie passiuelie, that is that through the malice of the false interpreter it is so irreuerentlie detorted & abused as if indeed it were as flexible as a nose of waxe. And according to this we see that none of that which our aduersarie produceth here out of the Romanists is anie argument of irreuerence against the trueth, & inuiolabilitie of Gods worde, but a calumnious accusatiō quite contrarie to the sense & meaning of the foresaid authours, who had not anie intention to taxe the scriptures but the corrupters & false interpreters of them, such as you pseudoreformers are your selues.

Lib. de Synodis.

And now altho' by this which I haue sayd in generall touching this point of blasphemie against

againſt ſcripture ſuppoſed to be perpetrated by the Romaniſts, the authors by the knight cyted remaine ſufficientlie cleared from the imputation which he layes vpon them in that nature: neuertheleſſe becauſe by the particular examen of the places cyted I haue diſcouered that either all or moſt of their wordes, be either corruptedlie rehearſed, or their ſenſe detorted, & abuſed, therefore I will ſeuerallie repeate their paſſages, & declare in what reſpects our aduerſarie hath deceitfullie traduced them.

And to begin with Lindanus, his ſtromata indeed I could not haue, but I haue read the place cited out of his Panoplia, where I finde that when he names the ſcripture a dead & killing letter, he onelie alludes to the wordes of S. Paule 2. Cor 3. *for the letter killeth, but the ſpirit giue lines.* Neither ſpeaking nor meaning worſe of the ſame ſcripture then the Apoſtle himſelfe: & affirming at the moſt, that the bare letter of the worde of God ill interpreted doth kill the ſoule, but reight expounded according to the tradition of the Church, it doth reuiue & nourish it, & brings it to eternall lyfe: yea & hauing better pondered his wordes in the end of the chapter quoted by Sir Humfrey, I perceiue the doth not abſolutelie call the ſcriptures a dead & killing letter, but onelie that the doctrine of that author (meaning the holie Ghoſt as I

Sicut illud eiuſdē autoris dogma in mortuas, imo ecidentes adeo litteras relatum. Panop. lib. 1. c. 44.

as I conceiue) is put in to dead & killing letters. As his wordes quoted in Latin in the margen declare. And in this same sense I may iustelie & truelie suppose the same authour speakes in the place quoted out of his other worke if any such saying he hath, in regarde that a graue & learned man as he is knowne to haue ben, is euer iudged to be sutable to himselfe in all times & places. Which learned diuine is yet further cõuinced, neuer to haue spoakẽ otherwise then reuerentlie of the scriptures in that in euerie seueral place cited by our aduersarie, he stileth them *sacræ litteræ. sacred letters.* And in like manner I conceiue of Charon, who as being of the same faith & religion he neither did nor dared to speake otherwise then with the same due respect which the Romã Church commaundes the Romanists to vse towardes the holie written worde of God.

Nec esse eas volunt cereum quendã naſum in ſenſum omnem flexibiles, ſed potius eſſe per ſe expoſitas & in promptu cuique ſine magiſtro & docente patere Canus lib. 3. ca. 7. f. 176 edit. Louan.

Canus in his 3. chapter of his second booke is abused by the knight, by his imposing vpon the Romanists that which Canus speakes of the Lutherans saying, that they will not haue the scriptures to be like a nose of waxe subiect to diuers senses but rather plaine for euerie one to vnderstand without a master or teacher: & thus the preposterous kniht doth positiuelie & affirmatiuelie impute that to the Romanists which Canus onely relates to be negatiuely asserted of the scriptures by the Lutherans.

Turrianus

Turrianus agregiously abuſed in that he is accuſed to call the ſcriptures a Delphick ſword, the riddles of Sphinx and the like: for he doth not abſolutely ſay they are ſuch, but onely ſaith that if Chriſt had left in his Church that rule onely which the pretended reformers receiued from Luther, to wit that ſcriptures are eaſie to be interpreted and vnderſtanded, and according as they haue hitherto expounded them in their owne ſenſe, then ſaith Turrian, *what els should we haue of them then a Delphick ſworde?* In which wordes you ſee he doth not affirme abſolutely that the ſcriptures are ſuch a ſworde, but onely that according as the ſectories handle them in their falſe manner of expounding, they may be ſo compared: and for this cauſe he puts for his marginall note, how to interpret ſcriptures according to ones owne proper ſenſe is as to haue a Delphick ſworde: & ſo by this & the authors wordes which I quote in the margen in Latin, his meaning is ſufficiently declared together with the knights calumnious proceeding againſt him.

Vos enim ſicut a Luthero didiciſtis ſcripturas ſanctas faciles ad intelligendum & interpretandum eſſe putatis, & ſic eas hactenus veſtro ſenſu intellexiſtis & interpretati eſtis. At ſi hanc ſolam regulam fidei Chriſtus in Eccleſia reliquiſſet, quid aliud quam gladium delphicum haberem⁹ &c. Quomodo interpretari ſcripturas ad libidinē proprij ſenſus ſit vt habere Delphicū gladium. cōtr. Sad. p. 99.

Leſſius is ill cited, for in his 11. reaſon he hath none of thoſe wordes quoted by Sir Humfrey, yet in his table he hath thoſe, *Scriptura quadratione naſus cereus, regula leshia &c. nuncupetur.* Cyting for this, his o[illegible]ne page 130. of his conſult. Where yet he hath not thoſe formall wordes which Sir Humfrey cites, but onely ſome

some others to that sense: yet the truth is he doth not apply e either the words or the sense to the Romanists, but to the noueliſts saying of them and their interpretation of scriptures by their priuate spirit. *Scripturam autem quisque pro suo captu & iudicio intelligit, vnde cum se putant scripturam habere, regulam credendi, loco scripturæ habent imaginationem propriam &c.* So that here we finde no blasphemie in Lessius, but impoſture in Sir Humfrey.

It is true, Lessius in his disputation of Antichriſt hath those formall words cyted by Sir Humfrey, in his page of the same number wher he saith: the scripture is called by Catholikes a nose of Wax & a Lesbious rule &c. but he presently explicates in what sense, to wit when it is taken for the bare wordes or letter onely secluding the sense of the Church & the interpretation of Fathers as saith he, it is taken by heretikes. So that it is plaine that Lessius doth not say that Catholikes calle the true scripture together with the true sense, a nose of Wax, but onely the naked text & as it is abused by corrupters. *An non regula illis Lesbia quam omnibus suis imaginationibus quantumuis absurdis accommodant & seruire faciunt, qui per Antichriſtum designari volunt non vnum hominem, sed plurimorum seriem &c.* And presently. *Apud Catholicos non est regula Lesbia quia est animata vero nimirum sensu qui contrarijs placitis apiari nequit*

Lessius demonstr. 35. p. 131.

Among

Among Catholikes, ſaith Leſſius (the ſcripture) is not a leſbie rule becauſe it is animated with true ſenſe which cannot be applyed to contrarie opinions. By which wordes it is euident that this author is mightely wronged being he hath the verye negatiue propoſition to that is impoſed vpon him.

In the citation of Pighius Sir Humfrey ought to haue continued his rehearſal from the beginning of his wordes to the end of the period of the authors whole paſſage, & then it would haue appeared plainelie howe falſelie he is accuſed. For ſo he diſcourſeth. But becauſe (ſaith he) no place of ſcripture is ſo plaine or open as it can defend itſelfe from the iniurie of the heretikes who adulterate, depraue, & detort it to their owne ſenſe, for they (as one no leſſe truelie then merrilie hath ſayd) are euen as a noſe of wax which doth eaſilie ſuffer it ſelfe to be fashioned & drawne this way, & that way, & which way thou wilſt, & like a certaine leaden rule vſed in the buildings of Lesbos, which is not harde to be accomodated to what you will; there muſt be a line ioyned vnto it, ſuch a one as is not as flexible as it ſelfe, but firme & ſtiffe, I ſay that pillar, that firmament of Catholike trueth, that is the common ſenſe & ſentence of the Church, then wee ſhall be certaine & ſure of the true vnderſtanding of the ſcriptures, if it

be

be consonant in all things to her which as she giues Canonicall authoritie to the scriptures, so is she truly the Lydius Lapis or touche stone of the true & Orthodox interpretation of the same &c. Thus farre, Pighius. Where he puts also for his marginall note. *Scripturas ab hæreticorum vi & iniuria se prorsus vindicare non posse*. That is: the scriptures can not vendicate or free them selues from the violence, & iniurie of heretikes. By which note alone, if his wordes in the text were not so plaine as they bee: yet is it clearer then the leight, that the comparisons which Pighius vseth be not applyed by him to the scriptures absolutelie but onelie as considered according to their bare caracters & letter, & as they are subiect to be corrupted by false interpretations: neither is he who vsed such speeches onelie with relation to the abusers of scripture more guiltie of iniurious proceeding against the scriptures them selues as truelie they are the worde of God: then those are esteemed to be iniurious to the writings of S. Thomas, & Aristotle, who by reason they are expounded in cõtrarie senses occasioned by their obscuritie, affirme their expositors make them a nose of wax, or compare them to some such other flexible matter, mierly in that respect.

Pighius l. 3. Hierarc. c. 3.

And conformable to this also which wee haue said because the Romanists know by experience how falselie the misreformers vse to

deale in their citations as partelie hath beẽ conuinced in diuers places of this cenſure, therefore & not for anie other cauſe doe they ſome tymes if they cite the Fathers, iuſtelie reiect them as by them corrupted or falſelie cited. And ſo if they cite Berengarius & the waldenſes they iuſtelie reiect them as heretikes: If they cite reformers for Romaniſts they iuſtely reiect them for none of theirs. If they cite Catholike authours impertinentlie, corruptedlie, or in a falſe ſenſe, they iuſtelie reiected them as abuſed by them & ſo remit them to the Cenſurers purgatorie. If they cite ſcriptures either falſelie tranſlated by addition, or detraction, or falſelie interpreted, or falſified, they iuſtelie reiect them as imperfect, & as made by them a couerture for theeues, & an officine or shop of heretikes, And yet notobſtanding all this it is manifeſt both by an expreſſe decree which the Councell of Trent made in the fourth ſeſ. againſt the profaners of the ſacred ſcriptures, as alſo by ſome ceremonies of the Maſſe it ſelfe, that the Romaniſts giue farre greater reuerence euerie way vnto them without compariſon then the Reformers. And the ſame I ſay of the ancient Fathers whō the Romaniſts as it is well knowne, reſpect ſo much that they accounte it plaine temeritie in anie writer to teach anie doctrine contrarie to the common conſent of them: Whereas one the contrarie, there

Decret. de edit. & vſu ſacrorum l. verſ. fin.

there is nothing more ordinarie among the writers of the misreformed Churches thē to reiect the authoritie of the ancient Fathers, or at the least to vilifie them & speake contemptuouslie of them as diuers of their workes doe testifie.

But for all this Sir Humfrey is still harping vpon that string that the Roman Church houlds the scriptures to be imperfect: but I knowe none that makes them so imperfect as the misreformed Churches by cutting of diuers partes of them, and condemning them for Apochripha in their consistoriall sessions, & by corrupting the text by false translations & erroneous interpretations as I haue aboue declared. And touching the Roman Church I haue alreadie tould him that he belyeth her. For neither she here selfe nor anie of her members euer defended that *tenet* absolutelie that the scriptures are imperfect. But onelie some Romanists affirme the scriptures alone to be no perfect rule of faith, yet they neuer say they are imperfect. For one thing it is to be perfect in them selues, & an other thing to be perfect as they be a rule of faith. The first is absolutelie true & maintained by all Romanists; the second is but true *secundum quid*, & with restriction, as before hath ben declared, or as it is but one parte yet the cheefest & the farre more perfect & noble,

noble. Wherefore the Romanists as the reader may perceiue hould both the scriptures & Fathers for perfect & compleit absolutelie speaking, whereas the reformers whatsoeuer they say in wordes, yet indeeds they doe mangle & martyrize them most cruellie, as a booke published by a reformed minister, called the censure of the Fathers doth giue ouer plaine testimonie. And thus handled by thim I graunt the reformers may chalenge them for theirs, but taking them in their compleit & perfect latitude & puritie, the Romanists may iustelie say all myne, in which action notwithstanding there is no practised to deceiue the ignorant, as the reformers vse to doe, but plaine dealing for their true instruction. *Censura Patrum.*

And to say the Romanists silence scriptures, it is so manifest an vntruth as it needs no other confutation. But by the lye. Neyther doe they otherwise purge either them or anie learned writers, but onelie, or at the least cheefelie from such darnell as you enimies to the Crop of Christ vse to sowe by night in the feild of faith. According to the sentence of the authour of the Impect Commentarie of S. Mathewe hom. 44. speaking of hereticall Preists, whose wordes altho' the knight would faine applie them against the Romanists, yet they can not possible be so trulie & fitlie accommodated to anie as to his

owne ministers & Bishops, whose common & knowne practice is by seueritie of lawes & all sortes of punishment & not by their bookes & writings to muzle the Romanists mouthes, because (to vse the wordes of the foresaid author) they knowe that if the truth be once layd open, their Church shall be forsaken & they from their Pontificall dignitie shall be brought downe to the baseneſſe of the people. And now we see by the examen of this whole sectiõ howe false Sir Humfreyes cardes haue proued & how plainelie he hath loſt the game notwithstanding all his iudling tricks & counterfeit shuffling, of which sleights there are such great store in this section that there is no place for anie matter of substance but onelie verball florishes to giue colour & countenance to his fained & calumnious accusations.

The XIV. Period.

Sir Humfrey tells vs that in this section following there are contained allegations collected out of Bellarmin for testification of the truth of the reformed doctrine in the cheefe points of controuersie.

I haue alreadie declared that the Romanists reiect not either true scriptures, or Fathers, nor yet anie other authours of the Roman Church, but onelie as either corrupted by heretikes,

retikes, or els onelie where we finde them to haue some singular opinion, or tenet against the vniforme doctrine of the rest in matters of faith manners, or Ecclesiasticall practice or discipline: or els in some particular points not then sufficientlie declared & determined by the Church when they did so vtter their opinions; of which sorte of writers neuertheless there neuer were anie such either in number or qualitie of doctrine as could either make or marre the antiquitie & vniuersalitie of the Church in that nature.

And as for Bellarmin whome Sir Humfrey citeth in this section, weare so farre from taking exceptions at anie thing that he euer writ & published, that we all hould him for a most faithfull & diligent defender not onelie of the principall points of our faith but also of euerie one of them in particular, & of the whole Roman doctrine in so much that I accounte it no lesse then plaine madnesse in that man whoe shall offer to make vse of his testimonie for the contrarie, knowing for certaine that if he be sincerelie alledged & rightlie vnderstãded, nothing can be founde in him for the aduerse parte. And to the end that this may more plainely appeare I will breeflie examen those particular places which Sir Humfrey produceth, for the contrarie.

First therefore he citeth Bellarmin as con-

feſſing the vncertainty of all the rẽt Sacramẽts (as the knight termeth thẽ) becauſe forſooth in his third booke of Iuſtification the 8. chap. he graunteth that none can be certaine by the certaintie of faith that he receiueth a true Sacrament, in regard in depends vpon the intention of the miniſter. But this teſtimonie I haue alreadie ſhewed to be deluſorie, & it is wholie impertinent to the purpoſe, for that the queſtion aboute the neceſſitie of the knowledge of the intention of the miniſter by faith, is no principall controuerſie betwixt vs but rather meerelie incident. Neyther yet can the reformers finde the contrarie poſition in anie place of ſcripture by that meanes to make it a point of faith for themſelues.

Secondlie he inducẽth Bellarmin lib. 3. de Euchariſt cap. 23. touching the reformers denyall of tranſſubſtantiation. To which place I haue alſo anſered before; & it is not for this purpoſe, in regarde there is no mention of anie denyall of the trueth of traſſubſtantiation, or confeſſion of the Reformers tenet in that point: but onelie of an other incident queſtion, viz. whether tranſſubſtantiation can be proued by expreſſe wordes of ſcripture. And at leaſt touching the maine point (to omit the other as impertinent & diſagreable to the title of our aduerſaries queſtiõ which is of principal points of controuerſie;) it is too cleare that Bellar-

Bellarmin defended the affirmatiue *in terminis*, in plaine tearmes. And so this is no such confession as Sir Humfrey seekes for in this place. Besides that all Bellarmins confession is but one pore *non est improbabile*:

Thirdlie he citeth Bellarmins confession against priuate Masse lib. 2. *de Missa* cap. 9. & 10. But the latter place I haue examined before & founde it corrupted by Sir Humfrey both in wordes & sense neyther are the wordes sincerelie recited by omission of *omnino*, &, *sine declaratione Ecclesiæ*, & transposition of the text. And here I further adde that neyther of the places is to this purpose, because they proue no vnlawfulnesse, or absolute imperfection in priuate Masses, but onelie at the most their lesse lawfulnes, their lesse perfection, or their want of frequentation in the primatiue ages: which is no principall point of controuersie betweene the Reformers, & Romanists, nay none at all.

And touching Bellarmins confession contained in the first place, viz. That we read not expressely, but gather by coniectures that the ancients did sacrifice without communion of some person, or persons, I say it is impertinent in regarde it inuolues no disproofe of priuate Masses, as our aduersarie counningly indeuores to persuade his vnaduised reader. It being sufficient for the instification of the pra-

ctise of them, that besides the authoritie of the presēt Church which approues them, not anie worde either of scripture, or ancient Fathers can be produced in which they ar condemned for vnlawful, or repugnant to Christs institution, or commaunde. And if more then this were required for matters of practise in this nature: certaine it is the pretensiue reformers of the Church, would neuer be able to iustifie their owne order, and prescription of cōmunicating at Easter, or some twise or thrise more in the yeare: or their newe prohibition of not receiuing their communion euen at the point of death without a competent number: of neyther of which they haue not as much as one pore instance, or example in the primatiue Church. By which it appeares that Bellarmins confession is in this passage preposterously alledged by the knight both in respect of the Roman Doctrine against which it concludeth nothing, as alsoe in respect of the inconuenience which by sequele and illation it induceth to his owne: whoe yet offers the Cardinal some further abuse by omission of the worde *facile*, in he recytal of his text.

Tamen id possumus ex cōiecturis facile colligere. Bellar. supra.

Where the reader may yet once more reflect, that altho' Bellarmin in his modestie tearmed the examples of antiquitie which he produceth for the practise of priuate Masses at the least in some particular cases, no more then con-

coniectures: yet if some of them be duely pondered & vrged with their circumstances, they may iustely passe for solid reasons: as that S. Chrysostome diuers tymes reprehending the people most sharpely & vehemently for making the Masses priuate by their not communicating in them: yet doth he not once either condemne such Masses in them selues, or he himselfe euer ceased to celebrate them dayly euen then when he most preached against the negligence of those who were present in them without receiuing the sacrament with the preist. Which doubtlesse is a morally concluding argument that Masses without communion of the people were vsed and esteemed lawful euen in those more primatiue & ancient ages. To which may not vnaptely be added for confirmation of the same discourse by way of aduertisment, that S. Chrysostome neuer affirmed in these occasions of complainte of the people, that Masses in which communicants ar wanting, be euill or contrarie to Christs ordinance or precept, but the most he said was, that the oblation is frustrate when ther be none to participate: which wordes of his ar soe farre from reprouing the practise, & vse of Masses without comunion of the people, that they necessarily imply e that the sacrifice was in realitie cebebrated, notobstanding the people did frustrate the intention of

the preist in that by their want of deuotion they receiued not the Communion which he had prepared for them: ſuppoſing it is abſolutely inpoſſible to conceiue that the Maſſe or oblation could be fruſtrated for wante of partakers, except it were in it ſelfe a Maſſe or oblation truely & really performed by the ſacrificer.

Fourthlie it is true that Bellarmin confeſſeth that in the primatiue Church, becauſe the Chriſtians were but fewe, they did all ſing & anſere in the diuine offices. But he affirmeth not that either it then was, or now is vnlawfull to haue the publike, or priuate prayer in an vnknowne tongue, which is the onelie point in controuerſie, the reformers defending touth & naile the affirmatiue, & the Romaniſts the negatiue. Nay Bellarmin is ſoe farre from confeſſing the reformers doctrine in this particular, that he expreſſelie affirmeth in the ſame place that the diuine offices in thoſe primatiue times were celebrated in Greeke which all the people did not vnderſtand, & yet cleareth this whole queſtion ſo farre that if Sir Humfrey had vſed anie ſparke of ſinceritie in citing Bellarmins wordes home & truelie, they would haue taken away all doubt concerning his meaning: Whereas by leauing out deceifullie the latter parte of his clauſe, he cauſed in his reader a preiudicate opinio of the true ſenſe, touching

ching which, and the faithleſſe proceeding of our aduerſarie about the ſame, the Cardinals owne wordes intirely recited will tell the truth: for thus he ſpeakes. At *obijcies ſicut Apoſtolus &c.* But (ſaith Bellarmin) you will obiect. As the Apoſtle would that the people might ſubioine, Amen: ſo alſo he was to ordaine that the diuine offices ſhould be celebrated in the vulgar tongue that the people might anſwer, Amen. I anſer by denying the conſequence, becauſe the diuine offices were performed in the Greeke tongue which manie of the people did vnderſtand, tho' not all, & this was ſufficient; for the Apoſtles will was not that all ſhould anſer. Beſides this, becauſe then the Chriſtians were fewe, they all ſung together in the Church, & anſered in the diuine offices: but afterwardes the multitude increaſing, the offices were more diuided, & it was left to the ſole cleargie to acomplish the common prayers, & Laudes in the Church. Thus plainely doth the Cardinall declare himſelfe for a ptofeſſed aduerſarie of Sir Humfrey & his comperes in this particular euen ſo farre as to ſolue their greateſt obiection which they vſe to frame againſt the practiſe of the Roman Church.

Bellar. l. 2. de verbo Dei. c. 16.

Firſtlie touching the allegation of Bellarmins confeſſion of the reformers tenet aboute the Communion in both kyndes, it is *moſt falſe* that Bellarmin confeſſeth it in the point in con-

tro-

trouersie, I meane it is false that he confesseth either Christ to haue commaunded the communion in both kyndes, or that the ancient Church practized the same onelie in both kyndes, both which points Bellarmin so expresselie declareth that Sir Humfrey could not possible haue found anie colour to haue alledged his confession for the contrarie if he had not mangled his wordes as he did in truth most shamefullie as may appeare most plainelie to him that will take paines to examen them as they are by him deliuered towardes the end of the chapter cited by the knight, where it is euident that the Cardinall proceedeth diametrally contrarie to the reformers doctrine in the principall point of this question according to his owne expresse wordes quoted in this my margen.

Bellarmin. l.2. de verbo Dei c. 16. *Idcirco quarendũ superest vtrum saltẽ diuino præcepto positiuo eiusmodi obligatio (communicandi sub vtraq; specie) in Ecclesia sit nos enim negamus, illi (sectarij) asserunt.* Bellar. lib. 4. de Eucha. c. 24.

Sixtlie touching the confession of Bellarmin aboute the duall number of proper Sacraments, we haue alreadie shewed him to be quite opposite to the reformers doctrine, & also haue examined the same place which Sir Humfrey citeth here and founde the sense of the Cardinall to haue ben egregiouslie by him transuerted & corrupted, & so here is no confession of anie principall point of controuersie made by him in fauour of his aduersaries, but a new repetition of an old impossture of the knights owne making.

La-

Laſtelie the knight citeth two places, of Bellarmin. The firſt out of his 3. booke of Iuſtification the 6. chapter, is touching the reformers faith & good workes which he affirmeth Bellarmin to confeſſe. But what a ridiculous allegation is this? For it is true Bellarmin confeſſeth in the place cited that the reformers hould faith & repentance are requiſite to iuſtification & that without them no man can be iuſtified, but this is no principall point of controuerſie: nay no queſtion at all betwene the Romaniſts & the reformers, but onelie a point of doctrine which the reformers doe commonlie teach & the Romaniſts doe not denie. So that this is impertinentlie alledged out of Bellarmin for faith & good workes ſince that in the wordes cited out of him there is not one ſillable of good workes, but onelie of faith & repentance as the reader ſees. But yet that which is moſt abſurde of all is that Sir Humfrey haueing here cited Bellarmins confeſſion that the reformers hould both faith & repentance to be required to iuſtification, yet preſentlie after he citeth the ſame Bellarmin as concluding with the reformed Churches iuſtification by faith onely, ſo that within the compaſſe of one page the knight out of the profunditie of his great head peace reſolueth in fauour of his owne cauſe out of Bellarmin both that without a liuely faith & an erneſt repen-

pentance no man is iuſtified, & alſo that according to the doctrine of the reformed Churches mans iuſtification is by faith onelie. Let the reader if he be able couple theſe two together, but if he can not let him hould for certaine that Sir Humfrey line was farre out of quare when he vttered ſuch diſparates. Now the ſecond place of the two laſte is touching iuſtification by faith onelie. But this hath ben examined before, & founde to containe no confeſſion of iuſtification by faith onelie (as the knight will haue it, vnaduiſedly contradicting him ſelfe out of an inordinate deſire to make Bellarmin ſeeme to ſtand for the doctrine of his Church) but onelie that Bellarmin ſpeaketh there of confidence in merits according to the ſenſe aboue declared.

And thus Sir Humfrey hauing cited all he can, which all neuertheleſſe is iuſte nothing, he addeth for all this that he wondreth why the Romaniſts ſhould ſend out ſuch Anathemas & curſes againſt all or anie of thoſe that denie their doctrine. But I wonder more that he who hath produced nothing either in this chapter or in the reſt of his booke out of Catholike authours which in his ſenſe & meaning doth not rather deſerue to be hiſſed at, then to be admitted for anie proofe of his doctrine, yet ſhould not be aſhamed to affirme that the beſt learned of the Romaniſts confeſſe

that

that manie principall points of their owne religion & manie articles of their faith, are neither ancient, safe, nor Catholike. And suerlie I can not conceiue but that both he & who soeuer els should vse so much false dealing as he hath done, in propugning their owne tenets especiallie in matters of religion, deserue the Anathema in the higheſt degree, that curse being the proper brande of the defenders of erroneous, hereticall, or scysmaticall doctrine. And indeed it seemes Sir Humfrey had not verie great conference in the industrie which he hath vsed in this his worke. For notobstanding it appeareth manifestlie that he putteth the greateſt streingth of his proofes through out his whole booke in the multitude of authours especiallie Romanists, whome by way of emendication or begerie he alledgeth as confessers of his faith, yet he here flyeth to the little flock & to the paucitie of beleeuers & to the simplicitie of babes as to speciall caracters of the true Church, & vtterlie disclaming from humane wisdome, power, & nobilitie: a pore refuge after so manie great boasts & bragges of the victorie obteined (as he imagineth, but falselie) by meere authoritie & multiplicitie of testimonies piled vp both in text, & margin; now to plead paucitie, simplicitie & want of power, & wisdome. And as for your paucitie in number Sir Humfrey I will not

stick

ſtick to graunt in regard that how great a shewe ſoeuer you haue made to the contrarie, yet I knowe you to be moſt pore & beggerlie in that nature, but yet I denie that to be a ſpeciall & infallible marke of the true Church as you inſinuate, no more then the paucitie of Manicheans or Donatiſts was a marke of the truth of their Churches. And the ſame I ſay of the want of might, wiſdome, nobilitie, I meane of true, power, wiſdome, & nobilitie, for of power, wiſdome & nobilitie of the flesh you muſt needs haue much more then the Romaniſts, in regarde it is well knowne you both handle & eate farre greater quantitie then they doe, witneſſe your little abſtinence & the reſt which modeſtie cauſeth mee to paſſe in ſilence: And touching your ſimplicitie except by ſimplicitie you meane plaine ignorance, you haue no colour here to bragge of it, for that there was neuer flock in the world, in my opinion, ſo full of all ſortes of duplicitie as your owne. Neither hath anie man greater reight to be a sheepe of that fould then the noble knight Sir Humfrey, who out of the abundance of his double dealing euen in this place, to ſay nothing of that which is paſte, hath made choiſe of as falſe & fallacious markes of his owne Church as he hath calumnioufflie fained markes for ours to wit counterfeit miracles which neuertheleſſe wee diſclame from & deteſt more

then

then he and all his consortes. And if they will needs medle of these matters, let them reflect vpon their Master Caluin how faine he would haue confirmed his newe Gospell with a forged resuscitation of a pore man who by his instructions, fained death, but the false Prophet fayling of his purpose committed a murder in steed of a miracle.

The knight saith further that we beleeue lyes: But I say that he doth not onely beleeue them but makes them, as appeares by this his pamphlet in which, as we see, ther is great store. We doe not deny with Lira but that some times in the Church there may be great deception of the people among the Preists in fained miracles: but these miracles if anie such ther be, are in the Church & in the Preists onely, as Lira discretely insinuate, not approued by the Church, & the Preists or their companions for lucre, as the false knight iniuriously affirmes, most corruptedly omitting in his translation of Lyra's wordes both the worde *aliquando* in the begining, & also the end of his sentence to wit: *& talia extirpanda sunt à bonis prelatis sicut ista extirpata sunt à Daniele.* And we yet further affirme with S. Augustin that he that seeketh to be confirmed by miracles nowe, is to be wondered at most of all himselfe in refusing to beleeue what all the world beleeueth besides himselfe. But in those wordes S. Augustin doth not

In Deut. 14.

Lyra in c. 14. Dan.

De ciuit. l. 2. c. 8.

not deny but that true miracles may be in the Church, nor yet that they were not in his time, for in his bookes de Ciuit. he affirmeth expreſſely that Chriſtian doctrine, not onely in the begining but alſo in the progreſſe, of the Church was confirmed by miracles, as beſides other places the very title of that ſame chapter rehearſed in my margen makes appeare to which theſe his wordes in the diſcourſe following plainely agree. *For* (ſaith S. Auguſtin) *euen at this preſent time miracles are operated or done in his name:* (in the name of Chriſt) *either by the Sacraments, or by the prayers, & memories of his ſaints.* And the ſame S. Aug. in the ſame place further relates one famous miracle in particular done at the bodie of S. Geruaſe, & Protaſe in Mila where he himſelfe remained at that preſent time. And by this it is euident that S. Aug. in the other place produced by Sir Humfrey onely condemneth him whoe for want of miracles ſhould refuſe to beleeue, to which we Romaniſts moſt willingly agree. And by this it appeareth that S. Auguſtin is here impertinently alledged by the knight. But the trueth is that becauſe theſe companions haue no miracles in their owne Church, they ſtriue by all meanes poſſible to obſcure the miracles of the Church of Rome & crye out like Bedlames; ther is no need of miracles.

Lib. 22. c. 8. *De miraculis quæ vt mundus in Chriſto crederet facta ſunt, & fieri mundo credente nõ deſinunt.* Tit. c. 8 li. 22.

And now to come to a concluſion of this ſection,

tion, & the censure of it, I would faine knowe of Sir Humfrey what is all this discourse of miracles to the purpose of testifying his doctrine by the confession of Bellarmin, surely nothing at all. & I persuade my selfe the knight was mightly distracted when he penned it, and so I leaue him till he returnes to his more perfect senses.

The XV. Period.

Sir Humfrey playeth the parte of a Charlatan so farre that he is not content by his prestigious trickes & sleights to laie clame to ancient Fathers & moderne Romanists for confessors of his owne faith, but also out of the groasenes of his education, in this section he presumeth to laie his greasie handes vpon those holie primatiue martyres, & champions of Iesus Christ ingrossing & conueying those sacred wares into his owne stincking storehouse, which neuertheless all ages, all Christian people, all nations haue till the dayes of Luther proclamed & testified to pertaine to the renowne & glorie of the Roman Church. And altho' he would seeme to proue that the forcsaid prime martyrs doe not belong to the Church of Rome, yet his cheefe proofe is but prating & an idle application of his owne tenets alreadie examined & confuted in their se-

uerall places, where they haue ben all founde either plainelie falſe, or at the leaſt equiuocall & founded vpon falſe ſuppoſitions vpon which no true argument can be framed: which being ſo I may iuſtelie ſaue labour to deſcend to particulars, yet one onelie wil I ſpecifie which is ſo shamefullie impertinent that it is ſufficient alone to shame the reſt.

He ſayth therefore that Father Garnet being demaunded whether if he were to conſecrate the Sacrament that morning he should ſuffer death, he durſt after conſecration affirme vpon his Saluation that the wine in the cup conſecrated was the verie blood of Chriſt which flowed from his ſide, he made anſere it might iuſtelie be doubted. This is the wiſe ſtorie which Sir Humfrey telleth vs out of Bishop Andrewes, which altho' wee are not bounde to beleeue as being iuſtified onelie by our aduerſaries, yet ſuppoſe it is as true as their Goſpell, it maketh not anie thing for this purpoſe, for that Sir Humfreys taske in this place was not to medle with martyrs of theſe later ages, but to demonſtrate that thoſe ancient martyrs of former ages did not die for that fayth which the preſent Roman Church profeſſeth, & ſo what ſoeuer he or his Prelate can faigne of Father Garnet is but a fooles boult which flying at randome cometh not neare the marke. Father Garnet

ſaith

ſayth hee, durſt not pronounce openlie ouer the cup after he had conſecrated it, this is the bloud of Chriſt, *ergo* neuer anie martyr did take it vpon his death that the conſecrated bread is the corporall & reall flesh of Chriſt. Behould I praye this moſt ſubtill Logike of a knight & admire it. Or if you liſt rather laffe at it as I did when I founde it out, & ſo I lefte it without anie further confutation, imagining that perhaps Sir Humfrey lõg before he was borne did miraculouſlie ſpeake with ſome of thoſe ancient ſouldiers of Chriſt, & ſo came to knowe that none of them euer gaue their liues for the reall preſence. Which in deed is the point in queſtion, & not whether a man can lawfullie pronounce vpon his Saluation whether this or that hoſte in particular after conſecration, containeth the bodie of Chriſt, as the knight captiouſlie ſuppoſeth

But yet shewing vs ſome more graines of his follie he ſayth further, that it is vndoubtedlie true that the ancient martyrs could not dye in that fayth nor for that religion which was altogether vnknowne to their church. O ingenious gẽtilman! but yet I pray tell me if the fore ſayd martyrs dyed not for the Romaniſts religion becauſe as you faigne, they dyed not for the profeſſion of the reall preſence, For what religion did they dye? Suerlie not for yours, becauſe if our religiõ was vnknowne vnto them,

much more was yours vnknowne to their ages which was not in the world before the daies of Luther, except perhaps your 39. articles were knowne vnto them by extraordinarie reuelation before they were coyned. It is true here we haue Sir Humfreys *ipse dixit* for confirmation of his tenet, & so it must needs be doubtlesse, his authority is so excessiuely great. And so I graunt the hypotheticall to be most true: And me thinkes it is not much vnlike to an other such like position of the Puritans, who vse to say: it is vnpossible for a man to be damned in their religion, & so a facetious Protestant confesses for certaine, as long as he liues in it, but if he dyes in it, ther's the question. Wherefore since all is but trifles that Sir Humfrey bringeth, I wish the reader of his booke to consider with himselfe how smale probabilitie there is to imagin that those glorious champions of Christ who so valerously suffered torments & died for him in the Roman Church, & manie of them at Rome it selfe, could possiblie belong to anie other Church in the world, then to that Church which as in that tyme it had the name of Roman Church so doth it still remaine with the same appellation not otherwise then by a continuall succession of the Popes of Rome, three & thirtie of which (as eloquent Campian truly obserueth) were put to death for their faith, which

Sir Tho. Ouerb. in his caract. of a Puritã or Precisian.

which their faith as it is manifeſt partlie by their owne workes, & partelie by the authenticall hiſtories of their martyrdomes, was the verie ſame according to the manner I haue before declared, which nowe is tought in the preſent Church of Rome.

And if this be not ſo, if thoſe glorious martyrs were not defenders of that Roman faith which by ſucceſſion of paſtours is detiued & arriued to this our time, I demaund of our aduerſaries of what other faith they were, for of the reformed faith they could not poſſible bee in regarde that none of them either tought in their life, or died for the defence of Iuſtification by faith onelie, or for the deniall of the reall preſence of the bodie & blood of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, nor for denying that there is anie other worde of God but onelie ſcripture. Nor for affirming that the images of Chriſt & his Saints are Idols, or that they who honore them adore idols, or ſtickes & ſtones, or that the Pope was Antichriſt: nor doe wee finde in anie hiſtorie either anie of this, nor yet that the foreſayd martyrs ſuffered for theſe, or anie other point of the reformers doctrine which is contrarie to the faith of the preſent Roman Church. Wherefore the ſayd reformers muſt neceſſarilie confeſſe that the ancient martyrs died either for ours or for no other Chriſtian doctrine, & conſequentlie that they are

eyther ours or no martyrs at all.

And if they were Popes of Rome as you Puritãs your ſelues cãnot denie, how could they poſſible be yours who beleeue the Pope is Antichriſt, & are ſo farre from that kynde of gouernemẽt that you doe not willingly admit eyther Pope, Prince, or Prelate, but onelie a conſiſtoriall Anarchie without head or feet. And he that ſhall duelie ponder theſe particulars, doubtleſſe his conſcience will tell him howe vniuſtelie Sir Humfrey indeuoreth to wreiſt from the Roman Church thoſe rich priſes. And let this ſuffice for the cenſure of this ſection & to shewe that the Romaniſts by their claime to the martyrs of the primatiue Church pretend nothing but their due.

The XVI. Period.

The 17. ſection containeth an anſere to an obiection of the Romaniſts drawne from the opinion of Proteſtants touching the Saluation of profeſſed Romaniſts, where Sir Humfrey telleth vs, he is come to the greateſt wonder. And I confeſſe the wonder which the knight propoſeth is great, but it being of his owne making, it is not hee that ought to wonder at it but rather in my opiniõ he ſhould leaue that to others. And truelie it is moſt wonderfull to mee to heare, that the Romaniſts

them-

themſelues ſhould confeſſe their owne doctrine to be different from the ancient Church in manie principall points of faith, but this hauing alreadie ben demonſtrated to be falſe & feigned by Sir Humfrey, the greateſt wonder of all wonders is that he ſhould haue the face to make a wonder of his owne ſo often repeated vutruthes. It is true the Romaniſts conſtantlie hould that neyther Lutheran nor Caluiniſt, nor anie other heretike or Scismatike dying in his hereſie obſtinatelie can be ſaued, for ſo they ſay with him that could commit no rashe iudgement, he that doth not beleeue is alreadie iudged. Neuertheleſſe wee Romaniſts doe not denie but that probably ſome ſimple people may liue in hereſie, & yet not be damned at the leaſt for hereſie, but may be ſaued by ignorance if with all they be free from other mortall ſinnes, eyther becauſe they neuer loſt their baptiſmall grace, or if they loſt it, by contrition they recouer it againe, which altho it be not impoſſible, yet is it verie full of dangerous difficultie morallie ſpeaking, & almoſt a Metaphiſicall caſe, & for ſuch I leaue it.

Qui autem non credit iam iudicatus eſt. Ioan. 3. 18.

Sir Humfrey proceedeth on babling aboute a Citie ſeated vpon ſeuen mountaines which he fondelie houldeth for a marke of the falſe Church & applyeth it to the Roman Church. But if Rome were the ſeate of the falſe Church becauſe it is planted vpon ſeuen mountaines,

then how ſcaped it from that ſtaine all thoſe
fiue hundreth yeares in which the reformers
themſelues graunt it was the mother Church?
Iacobus Rex epiſt. monit. Neyther hath the Roman Church anie ſuch
marke of aſſuming ſupreme authoritie ouer
Kings & Princes as the knight doth odiouſlie
affirme, but onelie with due reſpect & humility
vſeth that authoritie ouer them which Chriſt
himſelfe did conferre vpon her, in ſuch manner
as is moſt conducing to the Saluation of their
owne ſoules & their vaſſals according to the
rules of Chriſtian prudence, & the precept of
charitie. Yet not to dominier ouer them,
or their ſubiects in anie ſorte, & much leſſe to
approue or allowe of their oppreſſion either by
Maſſacre, or anie other vnlawfull meanes, as
the ſectaries & eſpeciallie the Puritans doe vſe
calumniouſlie to obiect, not obſtanding that
none in the world are more guiltie then them
ſelues in thoſe practices, of which we haue too
Nihil niſi calumniam & ſeditionem ſpirãtes Baſilic. dor. manie examples in Scotland, France, & other
places euen againſt Kings, & Princes, which
doubtleſſe cauſed King Iames of great Britanie
to ſpeake ſo plaine as he did both in his bookes
& ordinarie diſcourſes, of that particular.

After this Sir Humfrey deſcends to diuers
particulars & demaũdeth whether he & his fel-
lowes be accurſed for maintaining them or no?
and whether the Romaniſts be bleſſed for ſuch

&

& ſuch points which they defende againſt the ſectaries? And thus he runneth a long betweene bleſſing & curſing till he concludes caſting the curſes vpon the Romaniſts & the bleſſings vpon his owne Congregation. But becauſe ther is little or nothing but ſuch falſe ſtuffe as I haue alreadie examined & cēſured, & becauſe I haue quite ſurfeited with ſo frequēt repetitiō of the ſame ſubiect: I onely ſaye in generall, as he is bleſſed whoe heareth or obeyeth the Church in all things in regarde that by obeying the Church he obeyeth Chriſt whoe bleſſeth them that obey him: So contrarily he that diſobeyeth the Church in one onely thing he is accurſed according to the wordes of Chriſt him helfe, if he will not heare the Church let him be vnto to the, like an Ethnike or Publican, And ſo Sir Humfrey had no reaſon to Mat. 18. maruell if the Romaniſts accounte him & his fellowes accurſed becauſe they refuſe to imbrace & obey anie point of that doctrine which the moſt vniuerſall Church of the worlde propoſeth vnto them as doctrine to be receiued, beleeued, or practized by all faithfull Chriſtians. And as S. Auguſtin in the 41. of his fiftie homilies ſaith. Whoſoeuer is ſeparated frome the Catholique Church that is to ſay that Church which ſpred in ouer the whole worlde (as he ſpecifieth in the precedens wordes) how laudably ſoeuer he thinkes he liueth,

liueth, for that onely sinne that he is diuided from the vnity of Christ he shall not obteine life eternall, but the wrath of God remaineth vpon him. In which wordes as the reader may see according to the sentence of S. Augustin, separation from the obedience of the vniuersall Church is sufficient to bring the curse vpon anie man notobstanding in other respects he liueth neuer so virtuously.

And according to this the Romanists may bould[ly] say they are accursed whoe deny all merit in workes proceeding from the grace of God, & they blessed with Sainct Bernard (whom Caluin himselfe calleth a holye & pious man) that affirme with him that *it is a pernicious prouertie to want merits*, & yet especially at the houre of their death for humilitie with the same S. Bernard put all their confidence in the mercy of God; that which the Romanists doe much more then the reformers, notobstanding their defence of meritorious workes.

Ser. 68. in Cant.

They are accursed whoe otherwise then Christ tought or affirmed, teach & affirme it vnlawfull for the laitye to communicate in one kynde: And they blessed whoe with Christ & his Church take it for a thing indifferent of it selfe to receiue in one or both kyndes, & stand to the ordinãce of the most vniuersall Church without contention, according to the diffe-

rence

rence of times, places, & persons.

They are accursed whoe being vnlearned read scriptures & interpret them falsely for the maintenance of their errours, according to that of S. Peter saying: ther are certaine places in S. Paules Epistles which the vnlearned depraue to their owne purdition: but blessed are they whoe read them as the Eunuch did, that is with a S. Philipe, I meane with one to shewe them the true sense, & as S. Basil & his brother Nazianzene did, (whoe according to Rufinus) read the scriptures following the sense of them not according to their owne presumption, but according to the writinges of their predecessours, notwithstanding they were both, verie famous, & renowned in learning. Epist. 2. c. 3. Lib. 11. cap. 9.

They are accursed whoe either prohibit mariage or meates as ill in them selues as some ancient heretikes did, or abstaine not from them both at such times & in such cases as God & his Church ordaineth them to abstaine: And they are blessed whoe according to the order of the Church directed by the spirit of God remaine with S. Paule vnmaried, & refraine from eating flesh at such times as the same Church appointeth.

Those are accursed for contemning of Christ in his Church, whoe contrary to her appointmēt, doe schismatically administer the publike seruice & Sacraments in the vulgar tongue,

erro-

erroneously defending the same to be commaunded by the scriptures: & blessed are those whoe for reuerence to the holy scriptures & conseruation of the dignity of the diuine offices, & other iust reasons, hould it fitting to administer publike seruice & Sacraments in a language most common to all nations, to wit in the Latin tongue.

They are accursed whoe loue Christ & his Saints so little as they accounte it idolatrie, & contrary to the scriptures to honore their images, notobstãding ther is no place of scripture truly interpreted to be founde against them: & those are blessed according to the same scriptures whoe to shewe their exterordinarie affection to Christ, duely reuerence both the images of him & his blessed seruants.

They are accursed that refuse either to adore Christs bodie whersoeuer he affirmeth it to bee, or account it idolatrie or superstition to honore the Saints who he himselfe saith he honoreth with a crowne of glorie: & blessed are they that performe his pleasure in both by adoring his pretious bodie & blood in the sacrament, & by honoring his Saints in Heauen where he doth honour them as his seruants & freinds.

Si quis mihi ministrauerit honorificabit eum Pater meus &c.

They are accursed who contrary to scripture reiect such ancient traditions as the most vniuersall Church approueth: & blessed are

those

those who with due obedience obserue the same.

Accursed are they who reiect charitie frome the formall cause of iustification, which notobstanding according to the Apostle, is greater then either hope or faith: & blessed are they who admit it in iustification as well as faith & preferre it before faith with the same Apostle. *Maior autem horum est charitas.* 1. Cor. 13.

Accursed are they that by denying with the Iewes the bookes of the Machabies to be Canonicall scriptures, denie Purgatory & prayer for the soules departed: & blessed are they who with the Church & S. Augustin hould the foresayd bookes for canonicall scripture, & say with him it is an vndoubted thing that prayer doth profit the dead. *Non dubiũ est oration prodesse defunctis.* Aug. de cura pro mort. c. 1.

And in this mãner, if need were I could passe throu' all the rest of the points of controuerted doctrine, & easily showe the curse to fall vpon the misreformed brothers for their obstinacie & disobedience to God & his Church.

Sir Humfrey would faine seeme to beare a charitable minde towardes the Romanists in regarde he saith, he dares not pronounce damnation vpon their persons, and yet he proclaimeth confidently & opẽly to the whole world that their doctrine is damnable, to which it is necessarily consequent that all such as die obstinately in it are directly damned: & so if Sir Hum-

Hufrey proceeds cõſequenter to this his tenet, he muſt neceſſity iudge the ſame of at the leaſt in generall of thoſe which dye in the forc. ſaid obſtinate manner & with out inuincible ignorance end their liues in it. But if this be that which he calls greater charitie them Romaniſts haue, & all the fauour he doth vs, we thanke him not forit, & ſuch charitie he may better reſerue to himſelfe & his brothers who in my opiniõ haue no more thẽ they can ſpare. And if this be all the difference which can be foũde betwixt the proceeding of the Romaniſts & the reformers in this particular, then I ſay that notwithſtanding Sir Humfrey much laboureth to make his reader beleeue that he & his reformed brothers are more charitable thẽ the Romaniſts in iudging of the ſtate of the ſoules of ſuch as departe in each religion: neuertheleſſe it is manifeſt he quite faileth of his intent: ſuppoſing that the Romaniſts doe not vſe to iudge but rather ſuſpend their iudgment of particular perſons, except they haue ſome ſpeciall reaſons prudently & morally to perſuade themſelues that this or that partie died in actuall obſtinacie & defence of his erroneous faith, otherwiſe their cenſure is onely conditionall or a generall & abſtractiue manner. It is trrue he graunteth that ſome of his doctours affirme that a Papiſt may be ſaued, but he deliuereth his owne gloſſe vpon it ſaying it

is

is ment onelie by inuincible ignorance,& ſo by his owne commẽtarie he corrupted the whole text. And if this be the beſt conſtruction his charitie can afford wee will thanke him for it as much is it deſerueth. Neuertheleſſe it is no matter what either Sir Hũfrey or his fellowes ſay in this point, wee eſteeme not ſo much of there iudgements as to frame out of them, anie rule for the ſafe way of ſaluation: for this rule, wee had long before their Church was built wee had it frome the way maker him ſelfe. And I tell you by the way Sir Humfrey that if any of your Church be ſaued in the manner I haue declared in the begining of this Period, they are abſolutely ſaid to be ſaued in our Church not in yours, thoguh exteriorlie they liue & dye in yours. And ſo to conclud, if you will not permit the Romaniſts to drawe an argument from the confeſſion of ſome of your authours, but will needs affirme with your greateſt doctour & ArchPuritan whitaker, that vpon his worde ther is not one Papiſt to be founde in Heauen, I for my parte vpon condition you brag not of a victorie as you vſe to doe, I will not contend with you, but as in a matter neither of faith, nor yet of anie great conſequence ſuppoſing your owne peruerſe gloſſes, I leaue you to your owne ſenſe, as alſo I doe thoſe Romaniſts whoe vſed that argument againſt ſome of their aduerſaries.

THE

The XVII. Period.

Sir Humfrey hath played the Iacke ſo long that in this his laſt ſection he playeth Iacke on both ſides, telling vs in the title that he intendeth to showe that the Proteſtant religion is ſafer by the confeſſion of both parties, that is, both of Romaniſts & Reformers.

But I knowe not to what end he made this ſection except is was onely to make the number of his ſections euē, for I finde nothing in it but a new repetitiō of old matters ſo oftē alredy inculcated that my eares are wearie to heare them. And if Sir Humfrey was diſpoſed to playe in the number, he ought rather to haue made choiſe of the od nūber thē of the euen as being in the Poets opiniō more pleaſing to God, *Deus numero impare gaudet*. But let this paſſe, for how ſoeuer hee doth, I for my parte deſire not to ſtand vpon numbers but vpon ſubſtance. If he had brought either newe matter, or at the leaſt, ſome new proofe of the old, it might perhaps haue ben worth the labour to examen it, but I finde onely old matter & newe equiuocations, ſleights, & falſities, & theſe onely I will breefely diſcuſſe.

But the whole drift of the knight in this his laſt ſectiō is, as he ſaith him ſelfe, to make good the title of his booke, which is that therfore he

hee & his fellowes are in the ſafer way becauſe quotteth he, the Romaniſts agree with vs in the principall points of doctrine: & becauſe that is the ſafer way wherin differing partes ioyne both in one, & this I hould to be the ſubſtance of his whole diſcourſe if anie ther were to be founde in it.

Firſt therefore he telleth vs great newes to wit that there is a Heauen & a hell, in the beleefe of which, ſayth hee, wee both agree, & thence he concludeth that this is the ſafer way becauſe both ſides ioine in it. But this, if you marke it, is meere Sophiſtrie, for in ſtead of a whole way both in this particular and in the reſt of the points of controuerſie he paſſeth throu' in this ſection, he sheweth but a peece of a way. The whole way which he ought to shewe in this one point is the reformers beleefe of heauen & hell & their denyall of Purgatory & limbus, Now Sir Humfrey putteth in truly the firſt parte of his way to wit, the reformers beleefe of heauen & hell, (how true this is I knowe not) but he leaueth out deceitfullie the ſecond parte of the way viz. the Reformers beleefe in the denyall of Purgatorie & Limbus, & ſo as I ſayd before in ſtead of the whole way he sheweth but a peece, which peece altho' it be ſuppoſed to be neuer ſo ſafe, yet it will not ſerue the turne to bring a man to his iourneys end, nor yealdeth him anie more certaintie or

ſaftie in his way then he that should tell one who is vpō his iourney to yorke, that his ſafeſt way is to goe from London to Iſlinton, & there should leaue him to shifte for himſelfe for his directions in the reſt of the way, in which caſe certaine it is the traueller should be little or nothing obledged to him who shewes him that parte of the way onelie which all the world knoweth. And the trueth is that Sir Humfrey argueth in this whole matter as if he should ſay of himſelfe & his fellow reformers, we & the Turkes agree in the creed of one God & differ in the beleefe of Chriſt the Meſſias, therefore it is the ſafer way to beleeue onelie in one God in which wee all agree, then to beleeue in God & Chriſt too, in which wee ſtand ſingle. Euen ſo concludeth the knight of the faith of Purgatorie, Limbus, & the reſt of the points in controuerſy which he particularizeth in the diſcourſe of this ſection, arguing no otherwiſe then in this abſurde manner. Neyther is it, ô Sir Humfrey, our ſtanding ſingle by our ſelues, or double with you that eyther maketh or marreth either the faith of Purgatorie, or anie other article of the Roman doctrine as you falſelie & fallaciouſlie ſuppoſe in your argument: But ſcriptures, generall Councells, Fathers & the authoritie of the moſt vniuerſall Church are the pilars vpon which the houſe of our faith is built.

And

And as for your ioyning with vs in anie one article, or els in the generall assertion of some of your authours that wee may be saued in our Church, how soeuer it may seeme to some to be a confirmation of out faith, yet is it not anie parte of the foundation of our faith, but onelie a kynde of morall argument or motiue that we are in the safer way because euen some of our aduersaries themselues hould we may be saued in it. But yet as this alone, if otherwise we did faile in the true grounds of our faith them selues, can not be a sufficient proofe that we are in the safer way then you, so ought it not to be a sufficient proofe that you are in the safer way because we agree with you in some parte of your doctrine. Especiallie considering you faile in the cheefe grounds of your faith as hath ben shewed partelie in my this cesure, & partelie by other Catholike diuines in their seuerall workes. And if anie argument for the greater safetie of your way could be drawne from our agreement with you in some points of faith, so in like manner might we deduce a proofe of the greater saftie of our way from the certaintie of those points of faith in which you agree with vs, all which is but nugatorie, friuolous, & absurd in regarde that as, *a parte ad totum*, from a parte to the whole no awfull deduction can be made, so neyther can it be inferred that because one parte of the ob-

iect of a mans faith is true, therefore the whole obiect of is faith is true by reason that notob-
. ſtanding one parte of the obiect be true, yet there may bein the whole obiect or matter trueth & falſitie mixed together, of which we haue inſtãces both in diuine & humane matters.

And more then this, Sir Humfrey muſt giue vs licence to tell him that he was to forward in the proofe of his tenet. For before he went aboute to proue his way to be ſafer then ours, he ought firſt to haue conuinced his owne way to be a true & perfect way, & not to haue giuen his reader a parte for the whole by a falſe Senecdoche, or contrarie to the Grammer rules to obtrude vpon him a comparatiue without a poſitiue, that is a ſafer way were no way is to be found at all, or at the leaſt no ſafe & intyre way. And yet more ouer it is to be obſerued that beſides thoſe poſitiue points of doctrine in which he ſayth that both partes agree, there be alſo diuers negatiues which they quite diſtinguiſh one from an other, which negatiues neuertheleſſe are parte of the reformers faith as well as their poſitiue doctrine, & ſo in this parte of their Creed they ſtand ſingle as well as we, & conſequentlie if ſtanding ſingle, as he auerreth or at the leaſt ſuppoſeth, doth hinder the ſafetie of our way, the ſame effect it muſt of neceſſitie haue in theirs, & according to this ground of Sir Humfreys it is manifeſt

that

that the reformers can neuer haue the safe way till we ioyne with them in euerie point thereof by that meanes to hinder their single standing, which yet we assure our selues will neuer come to passe, except God almightie reduce them to vs from whome they once departed, as we greatlie desire & daylie praye.

And according to this wee may breeflie anfere to all the rest of the instances which the knight produceth. And so we Romanists confesse we stand with the reformers in the affirmation of heauen & hell, but we stand not with them in the denial of Purgatorie *& limbus*. We stand with them in the affirmation of the merits and satisfactions of Iesus Christ: But we stand not with them in the negation of the merits & satisfactions of those that liue in the grace of God, & by the virtue of the same & the cooperation of their owne free will, performe good workes of charitie, mercie, iustice, & the like, houlding for certaine with S. Augustin that he who created vs without vs, will not saue vs without vs: yet further assuring our selues that God doth not operate with beasts & men both in one manner. We stand with them in the defence of Baptisme & Eucharist so farre as they Orthodoxlie maintainte them, but we stand not with them in the impugnation of the other fiue Sacra-

ments. We ſtand with them in that they affirme that the images of Chriſt & his Saints are ornaments & memorialls of the abſent: but we ſtand not with them in their denyall of due honour to be exhibited vnto them for the great loue & reuerence we beare to Chriſt & his Saints. We ſtand with them in the defence of the diuine worship of God: but we ſtand not with them in the denyall of interceſſiue inuocation & honour of his Saints. We ſtand with them in that Chriſt is the prime mediator betwixt God & man: but we ſtand not with them in their denyall of the ſecondarie mediators, or interceſſors which are his ſeruants & frends. We ſtand with them in that Chriſt is head Monarch of the whole Church triumphant & militant: but we ſtand not with them in their denyall of the viſible & Vicarious head the Pope or cheefe paſtour of the viſible Church in earth ſubordinate & ſubiect to Chriſt in the gouernement of the ſame. We will not refuſe to ſtand with them in that they graunt that S. Peter had a Primacie of Order: but we ſtand not with them in that they denie his Primacie of power & Iuriſdiction. We ſtand with them in that they teach there are 22. bookes of Canonicall ſcripture: but we ſtand not with them in the refuſall of the booke of Tobie, Iudith, two firſt bookes of Machabees, the booke of wiſdome,

wisdome, Esdras & Baruch the Prophet. We stand with thē in that they affirme the scripture is the rule of faith: But we stand not with them in their denyall of diuine traditiōs, not properly added to the scriptures but commended by them & included in them in a general manner. We stand with them in that they say there are twelue articles of the Creed: But we stand not with them in their denyall of the rest of the doctrine defined in generall Councells: as neither doe we ioyne with them in the defence of all the 39. Articles of the English faith or Creed.

And so now by these particulars the iudicious reader may euidentlie perceiue that by reason the Romanists agree with the knight onelie in some parte or partiall of his doctrine, he could not possible proue by their confessions the greater safetie of his way, as both in the title of this his last section, & also in the title of his whole booke he did propose. Nay he is so farre from the proofe of this, that he hath most apparentlie fayled in the proofe of the verie argument of his whole worke which to the end it may more plainelie appeare I will reduce to this Sylogisme.

That faith is the safe way leading all Christians to the true, ancient & Catholike faith, which is proued by the confessions & testimo-

nies of the best learned Romanists to haue ben visible in all ages especiallie before the dayes of Luther. But the faith now professed in the Church of England, is proued by the confessions & testimonies of the best learned Romanists to haue ben visible in all ages especiallie before the dayes of Luther. Therefore the faith now professed in the Church of England is the safe way leading all Christians to the true, ancient, & Catholike faith.

Now there being contained in the minor of this Sylogisme the whole argument, purpose, & drift of Sir Humfreys whole booke, & yet neuertheless it hauing ben by mee in this my censure demonstrated not to haue ben proued and made good by anie argument by him produced, all he produceth to that purpose being voyde of force as by the discussion of the particulars of euerie section the reader may easilie vnderstand, it followeth by a necessarie sequele that his way can not be safe, but is to be auoyded with most great care & circumspection as a false & erroneous path, by all those that tender the safetie of their soules & eternall Saluation.

And thus hauing now resolued the man into his principles or prime matter I meane into the dust & ashes which he casteth in his reader eyes: & hauing passed throu' all the passages of his

his imaginarie safe way, I haue founde it & shewed it to be no way at all, but an intricate diuerticle or obscure path leading pore distressed trauellers quite out of the true royall street with an impossibilite euer to come to the end of their iourney, that is to the true ancient Catholike faith, which faith altho' the knight both in the title of his booke & in diuers other places of it, hath seriouslie promised to shew it to be the same which is now professed in England, euen by the confession of the Romanists yet haue I made it manifest that no true Romanist that is no authour which is acknowledged by the Roman Church for a member of the same, did either in generall or in particular euer confesse the foresaid faith of England to be the ancient Catholike faith, or that did euer, absolutelie & in the same sense in which the reformed Churches doe, defende anie one article of the pretensiue reformed doctrine in matter of faith or generallie defined manners. In regard of which & because my cheefe intent was when I first resolued to vndertake this busines out of a tender compassion to free the readers from the great & generall delusion which I vnderstood this pamphlet of Sir Humfreys had caused, or might hereafter cause in the myndes of manie, & especiallie the more vnlearned sorte of people, altho' in verie

very truth in itself it containeth nothing worth the labour of a scholler, I doe now admonish them as they esteeme the saftie of their soules, to beware of it as of a shop of most deceitelie & poysonous drugges of which they cā not safely taste without an antidote, I meane the illiterate or vnexperienced persons in this kynde of studie, can not securelie reade the the booke except with all they view the aduerse parte, & so by detection of the authours fraudes, & couning deceipts they behould the truth discouered, which otherwise as being most subtillie innolued & mixed by him with abundance of plausible vntruthes, equiuocations, false suppositions & Sophismes, can hardlie be founde out euen by those of greater learning & capacitie then ordinarilie the laytie vse to be.

If truly the worke is this.

And as for Sir Humfrey him selfe, altho' I haue smale hope of his reclamation in regard of the great arrogācy which I perceiue in him, as being mightily blinded with the vanity of his owne conceite, yet will I not omit to crie a loude ynto him with the sacred psalmist, *vtinam saperet & intelligeret, ac nouissima prouideret*, would to God he would seriously consider that there will come a time when his booke shall passe a farre more strict examen & sentence of condemnation then here it hath

passed,

passed, or can possible passe in this mortall life. And yet if perhaps he findes in the answere of it, any more sharpe or vnpleasing speaches then he would willingly heare, I earnestly intreate him to account them not As spoken against his person, but precisely as he is infected with the spirituall plague of schisme & heresie, and as whose conuersion to the most vniuersally florishing Church an faith (notobstanding whatsoeuer wordes haue passed in heate of disputation) I earnestely desire & prayse for. And with this desire & affection I commend him to the infinit goodnesse & mercy of all-mightie God.

THE

THE ROMANISTS AGREE WITH S. AVgustin in the diuision of the Commaundements.

In his 71. queſtion vpon the booke of Exodus *and in his 119. epiſtle to Ianuarius he diuideth them in this manner.*

1. THou ſhalt haue no other Gods but me.
2. Thou ſhalt not take the name of God in vaine.
3. Thou ſhalt ſanctifie the ſabboth.
4. Honor thy Father & thy mother.
5. Thou ſhalt not kill.
6. Thou ſhalt not commit adulterie.
7. Thou ſhalt not ſteale.
8. Thou ſhalt not beare falſe witneſſe againſt thy neighbour.
9. Thou ſhalt not deſire thy neighbours wife.
10. Thou ſhalt not deſire any of thy neighbours goods.

The Romaniſts in their briefe Catechiſmes for children commonly rehearſe them thus.

1. THou shalt haue no other Gods but me.
2. Thou shalt not take the, name of God in vaine.
3. Remember to ſanctifie the Sabbaoth day.
4. Honore thy ffather & thy mother.
5. Thou shalt not kill.
6. Thou shalt not commit adulterie.
7. Thou shalt not ſteale.
8. Thou shalt not beare falſe witneſſe againſt thy neighbour.
9. Thou shalt not deſire thy neighbours wife.
10. shalt not deſire thy neighbours goods.

The miſreformers diuiſion of the Commaundements is this.

THou shalt haue no other Gods but me.
Thou shalt not make to thy ſelfe any grauen image &c.
Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vaine &c.
Remember that thou keepe holy the Sabbath day &c.
Honor thy father & thy mother &c.
Thou shalt doe no murther.

Thou

Thou shalt not commit adultery.
thou shalt not steale.
Thou shalt not beare false witnesse.
Against thy neighbour.
Thou shalt shalt not couet thy neighbours house; thou shalt not couet thy neghbours wife, nor his seruant, nor his made, nor his oxe, nor his asse, nor any thing that is his.

In this diuision they dissent both frome S. Augustin & the scriptures as appeareth by their Catechismes published euer since the change of Religion in England.

From S. Augustin, in that they put for the second Commaundement: *thou shalt not make to thy selfe any grauen image*: where as hee on the contrary in his epistle to Ianuarius, expressely putteth not for the second but for the first Commaundement these wordes. Thou *shalt not make to thy selfe any idol.*

They dissent alsoe from the scripture both in that those wordes which they put for the second Commaundement, the scripture setteth them downe in the very same tenor & continuation of style with those which according to both parties is the first Commaundement, to wit: *Thou shalt haue no other Gods but me*, adding alsoe one & the same punishment after that which the Reformers will needs haue to be an other Commaundement, which yet if they were distinct commandements, they should

rather

rather haue had distinct punishments assigned them seuerally.

As also secondly because in the text of Exodus out of which the reformers rehearse their Commaundements, the words are not, as they corruptedly translate & relate them, *Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any grauen image*, but: *thou shalt not make to thy selfe any grauen thing*. Which is yet more plainely explicated in the fourth of the Deut. to be vnderstood not so that there ought not any grauen similitude to be made, but that ther ought not anie to be made of those things which God prohibited, especially supposing that the Deuteronomie as the word it selfe doth signifie, is an exacte explication of the lawe Exodus, & that that which in the first Commaundement is forbiden in the Exodus, in the 26. of the Leuiticus the same is declared to be *idolum, & sculptile*, that is an idol & a grauen thing.

And thus wee see the reformers stand single in this matter, & that the Romanists in their diuision of the ten Commandements proceed vpon a most sound & approued foundation, it being both conformable to the doctrine of S. Augustin who they more willingly followe then anie other, & especially to the true sense of the scriptures them selues expounded according to the orthodoxe faith and tradition of all succeeding ages.

A POSTCRIPT OF ADVERTISSEMENTS FOR THE READER.

I Requeſt the reader of my Cenſure ſo take notice of ſome particulars which occurred ſince the finis hing of it.

And imprimis touching the homilie and epiſtles alledged by Sir Humfrey in the 9. ſection of his ſafe way againſt the reall preſence and tranſſubſtantion, I anſered in the 8. Period of my Cenſure what I conceiued at that preſent, to wit, that ther was not anie doctrine publikly or cõmonly read or preched in England contrarie ſo the reall preſence, or tranſſubſtantiation, or in anie publik manner deliuered to the people either by Alfric or anie other Bishop or Bishops in anie ſynod or publik aſſembly in thoſe dayes. ſince which tyme of the diſpatch of that worke ſome delaye hauing ben made in the cõmitting it to the preſſe, & hauing had greater opportunitie & leaſure to view the hiſtories of our countrie which treate of the affayres of thoſe ages in which Alfric liued, which was in ſome parte of the 10. and leuenth Centuries, by more exact examinatiõ & ſearch in to the matter

I finde my ſelfe aſſured of the trueth of that which I then deliuered. And now for greater ſatisfaction of the reader and more cleare conuincement of the ſame, I adde that touching Alfrics perſon, and ſtate of life, he was firſt a monke by profeſſion in the monaſterie of Abington, and as Maleſburie relates, Abbat of the ſame: then Biſhop of wilton, and after Archbiſhop of Canterburie. Ther is diuerſitie of opinions whether *Siricius alias ſigericus*, or Alfric did immediatelv ſucceed S. dunſtan in that ſeat, but that importeth little; certaine it he was a Roman Catholique, for that an ancient Chronicle writ by a monke of the ſame monaſterie of Abington (wher of as I alledged our of Malesburie, Alfric was Abat) conuinceth teſtifying that he went to Rome for his Epiſcopall pall, as the cuſtome was, which iourney Alfric would neiuer haue made, nor euer haue obtained his requeſt, if he had not ben of the ſame faith in euerie point which at that tyme the Pope him ſelfe profeſſed.

lib. 1. de geſt. Pont. Ang. pag. 203.

vid. Harpſf. ſæc. 10. cap. 7.

That which alſo is moſt plainely demonſtrated by an ample teſtimonie which the church of Canterburie gaue of the ſame Arcbishop Alfric, and at their requeſt ſent to the monkes of his order

and

and monasterie Abington for a perpetuall memorie of his faith and manners: which for greater sattsfaction of the reader, I will here rehearse at it as recorded by the foresaid religious man.

To the children of the holy church of Canterburie the clergie, and the same church after their deuoute prayers. It is knowne vnto you all how long since it is that by the successes of diuers and varions euents the mother church of England hath ben depriued of her pastor and destitute of her rector, which doth pertaine not onely to our losse but alsoe to the detriment of you and all this Iland, since it is apparent that the sollicitude and care of the whole countrie is committed to the Metroplican. For which cause we haue elected Alfric by name monke of the holy church of Abington most sufficiently knowne vnto vs, noble in brith and maners, indued with Apostolicall and Ecclesiasticall disciplins, and in faith a Catholique, by nature prudente, docible, patient, temperate, chaste, sober, humble, affable, mercifull, learned, instructed in the lawe of God, cautelous in the senses of the scripture, exercised in Ecclesiasticall decrees or determinations. And according to the path of scripture, orthodox traditions, and Canons, and constitutions of the Prelates of the Apostolicall seat, vnderstanding, teaching, and obseruing the Ecclesiasticall rules in a sound *Præsulum Sedis Apostolicæ.*

ſenſe, and embracing that faithfull worde which is according to doctrine: and reprehending with modeſtie thoſe whoe reſiſt it; and hauing power to reſiſte and redargue them: hoſpitable, modeſt, well ruling his houſe, not a neophit; hauing a good opinion or teſtimonie, miniſtering in euerie degree or order according to Eccleſiaſticall tradition. Prepared for all good workes, and to giue ſatisfaction to euerie one that ſhall demaunde it, of the hope which is in him. &c. Thus proceedeth the teſtimonie of the electors of Alfric.

And to this I ioyne that S. Dunſtan his immediate predeceſſor (excepting Ethelgar or at the moſt according to the opiniō of ſome writers. excepting Ethelgar and Siricius whoe both liued but fiue yeares or ther aboutes) as our hiſtories reporte at the tyme of his death ſpake much of the reall preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt in a ſermon he made the ſame day he dyed. And in like manner of Elphegus Alfrics ſucceſſor it is reported by our English hiſtorians, he was ſuch a mortifyed man by reaſon of his great abſtinence, and faſting that when according to the cuſtome of the Romā church he eleuated the ſacred hoaſte in maſſe, the reflected ayre appeared as it were in a glaſſe throu' the iunctures of his fingers. Now touching the twoe immediate predeceſſors of Alfric which I mentioned before to wit Ethelgar

Syr S. Dunſtan.

gar & Sricius neither anie hiſtoriogra pher nor yet anie of our aduerſaries themſelues doe note them to haue diuulged or admitted in their tyme anie other doctrine concerning the Euchariſt then that which was then profeſſed in the Roman church. By which it is manifeſt that both immediately before and immediately after Alfrics dayes, the ſame doctrine of the reall preſẽce which at this tyme the Romã church maintaines was cõmonly tought & practiſed in England and no other: ſoe that morally ſpeaking it is not apprehenſible that in the tyme of Alfrics being Biſhop of Canterburie which according to the computation of tymes was but ten yeares or littlemore, the contrarie doctrine and the denyall of the reall preſence and tranſſubſtantiation could haue bin publikly profeſſed and publiſhed by diuers Biſhops in their ſynods as Sir Humfrey Line affirmes.

Godwins Catalogue.

Beſydes this Lanfranc whoe in the next age ſucceeded Alfric in the ſeat of canterburie, in his booke againſt Berengarie of the ſacrament of the Euchariſt: ſom'at after the mideſt he ſpeakes thus againſt his aduerſarie. *Propulſatis iam quantum ſatis viſum eſt calumnijs &c.* hauing ſufficiẽtly repelled the calumniations which with cantumely of Biſhop Humbert & the Ro-

habetur in vlt. edit. Bibl. Patr. tom. 11.

Roman Church thou haſt temerariouſly vttered; it remaines that we expounde the faith of the holye church & the opinion of this ſect, & that hauing expounded them we approue one & reproue the other by a fewe authorities & breefe reaſons. For neither epiſtolar breuitie doth permit, nor anie reaſon requires that we inſert prolix teſtimonies of either ſcriptures or arguments of diſputation. For ſuch as ar faithfull people but ſeduced, doe not pertinatiouſly inſiſt in defence of their deprauation: but rather hauing heard & vnderſtanded reaſons, deſire humbly to returne to the way of truth, fewe things will ſuffice. But thoſe whoe ar addicted to contentions, & determined to perſiſte in their infidelitie, would not be ſatiſfyed althoù manie reaſons ſhould be propoſed vnto them.

Diuinitus. Wherfore we beleeue that the terreſtriall ſubſtances which in the table of our lord ar diuinely ſanctifyed by preiſtlie miniſtration, ar infallibly incomprehenſibly, & admirably by operation of ſupernaturall power conuerted in to the eſſence of our lordes bodie, the ſpecies or formes of the things thé ſelues remaining with ſome other qualities leaſt the receiuers ſhould abhorre crude & cruent things: & to the end that the credents or beleeuers might receiue more amplere-

Cruda & cruenta.

re-

wardes of their faith, the bodie of Christ it selfe existing neuertheleſſe in heauen at the reight hand of his Father, immortall vnuiolated, intyre, incontaminated, vnhurt, soe that it may truely be affirmed that we receiue the bodie of Christ which he assumed of the Virgin, and yet not the same. The same truly in respect of the properties of true nature and virtue: but not the same if you respect the species or formes of bread and wine; and the reſt before comprehended. *Illeso.*

This faith from ancient tymes did hould and now holdeth that Church which diffused throu the whole world is named Catholique: whence it is that, as it is said before, our lord said in the Euangill. Receiue and eate, this is my bodie. And this is the chalis of my bloud &c. In this cleare manner speaketh Lanfranc of the reall presence in this place. And page 346. of the same booke: he saith thus speaking of Eccleſiasticall histories. Which Scriptures saith he) altho' they doe not obtaine that most excellent tower of authoritie which those doe which we cal Propheticall and Euangelicall scriptures: yet they ar sufficiēt to proue that this faith which now we haue, all faithfull people which haue gone before vs, haue had the same from priuatiue tymes. And page 347. the *A primis temporibus*

same Lanfrane directing his speech to Berengarie addeth thus. more ower if that be true which thou beleeues and maintaines of the bodie of Christ, it is false which the church beleeues of the same matter in euerie natiõ. For all those whoe reioyce to be called, and to bee Christians, doe glorie in that they receiue in this sacrament the true flesh and bloud of Christs bodie receiued from the virgin. Inquire of all such as haue knouledge of the latin tongue, and of our writings. Inquire of the Grecians, Armenias, or of Christian people of anie nation what soeuer, & they will with one mouth testifye that they haue this faith. Furthermore if the faith of the vniuersall church be false, either ther neuer was Catholique church, or she hath perished. nothing is more efficatious for the perishing of soules then a pernicious error. But no Catholique will graunt that the church either was not, or that she hath perished. In this plaine sorte testifyes Lanfranc of the faith of the vniuersall church in which it were madnes to imagine he did not include his owne I meane the church of England. And supposing he liued & writ this the verie next age following the age in which Alfric dyed to wit in some parte of the leueth centurie, it is more then monsterous impudencie in our

ybique gentium.

aduersa-

aduerſaries to affirme that in the dayes of Alfric the denyall of the reall preſence and tranſſubſtantiation was commonely preached and beleeued in the Realme of England.

Further more. Paſcaſius Rathbertus writ a booke intituled of the bodie and bloud of our lord againſt the doctrine of Bertram, as is cõmõly ſuppoſed althoù I finde him not named by Paſcaſius: & he hath alſoe an Epiſtle of the ſame ſubiect to one Frudegard, with an expoſition of thoſe wordes of the Euangeliſt. *Cænantibus autem illis &c.* In all which writings Paſcaſius moſt plainely defendeth both the reall preſence and tranſſubſtantiation, moſt frequently repeating and inculcating that the ſame bodie and bloud which Chriſt receiued of the Virgin Marie, and the ſame in which he was crucifyed, is really and truely preſent in the Euchariſt and offered in ſacrifice. I need not relate his wordes for euerie particular, becauſe I knowe our aduerſaries can not denye but that this Author is plainely for the Romaniſts and flat againſt them in thoſe points of doctrine: onely I will rehearſe ſome generall wordes of his in which he declares the faith of the vniuerſall church in and before his tymes: for after teſtimonies of diuers ãciẽt fathers alledged to this purpoſe in

Math. 26.

the

the concluſion of the foreſaid wordes of S. Mathewe thus he ſaith. *Ecce habes amantiſſime &c.* Behould moſt louing brother, thou haſte in the end of this little booke the ſentences of the Catholique Fathers compendiouſly noted, by which thou maiſt learne that I haue not ſeene ſuch things in raſhnes of ſpeech when I was a child, but that I haue propoſed them by diuine authoritie, and by the authoritie of the holye Fathers to ſuch as demaunded them. But now it being cleare that Since that tyme the faith of all men is not one and the ſame, then ceaſe I praye to beleeue with ſuch as they bee, if as yet they can not vnderſtand that nothing is impoſſible to God, and lett them learne to aſſent vnto the diuine wurdes in all things, & to doubt nothing of thoſe: For till this preſent no man is read to haue erred in them except thoſe whoe erred aboute Chriſt himſelfe; notobſtanding manie doubted or haue ben ignorant of the Sacraments of ſoe great a Myſterie: And afterwardes the ſame author in the ſame treatiſe ſaith thus. *Quaexpleta voce, &c.* Which wordes being pronounced (meaning the wordes of conſecration) we all with one conſonant voyce ſay. Amen.

And ſoe the whole Church in all nations

tions and languages doth pray and confesse, that it is that thing which she prayeth for, wherby let him whoe will rather contradict this then beleeue it regarde what he doth against our lord him self, against the whole Church of Christ.

Therfore it is a nefarious and detestable villanie to pray with all and not to beleeue that which truth it self doth testifye, and that which vniuersally all in euerie place doe teach. Whence it is that since he him selfe affirmes it is his bodie and his bloud, doubt ought not to be made in anie thing, altho' we see not with carnall yes that which we beleeue. We haue seene alsoe what Pope Gregorie houldeth of this, what S. Cyrill with all his fellow Bishops assembled in Ephesus, what Greece with them, what Egipt, and what S. Hierome him self whoe published the liues of the holye Fathers in latin. And therfore not obstanding some erre in this by ignorance neuerthebesse as yet ther is none that openly contradictes that which the whole world doth beleeue & confesse. Thus Pascasius a learned and venerable, and virtuous Abbat testifyeth the faith of the vniuersall Church in his dayes touching the reall presence, of Christ in the Eucharist. Whoe altho'

he

he was not English nor liued iuſte in the tyme of Alfric, yet he liued within the compaſſe of the ſame age in which Alfric was Biſhop of wilton and Archbiſhop of Canterburie that is the yeare 900. yea it may be Paſcaſius was yet aliue whē Alfric was Abbat and conſequently when he is ſuppoſed by our aduerſaries to haue writ thoſe epiſtles which they produce in his name concerning this matter. Soe that by this teſtimonie of Paſcaſius a forcible argument is made that the contrarie doctrine of the reall preſence cauld not poſſible haue ben ſoe publick and common in anie parte of the Chriſtian world in ſoe shorte a ſpace of tyme as paſſed, (if anie paſſed) betwixt Paſcaſius and the writing of the homilie and Epiſtles attributed to Alfric if he did-euer write them.

And how beit is may appeare by the writings of Paſcaſius that ther were ſome in, or aboute his tyme whoe argued & writ in an vnacuſtomed and new manner touching the doctrine of the preſence of Chriſts bodie and bloud in the Sacrament as particularly Ioannes, Scotus, Bertrame and Frudegarde, yet as much as I can perceiue by reading Paſcaſius, Fulbertus, Stephanus Eduēſis, & others whoe writ of this matter, the broachers of this queſtion did neuer abſolutely

auerre

auerre and maintaine anie assertion directly repugnant to the true, and reall existence of Christs bodie and bloud in the Eucharist, but onely made a schoole question of it arguing the matter *pro and contra*: and that not determinately of the reall presence, but whether the same bodie, & bloud of Christ which was borne of the Virgin Marie & was crucifyed vpon the Crosse, was contained vnder the formes of bread and wine in the Sacrament, & not rather some other kynd of Christs bodie and bloud, yet truely his and truely present in the Eucharist, thou in a figuratiue and tropicall manner.

And that neither the named authors nor anie other in or aboute Pascasius tyme did plainely or of set purpose impugne the reall presence, it plainely appeares by his wordes aboue cited affirming that *not obstanding some erredby ignorance, yet that none did openly contradict that which the whole world did beleeue and confesse.*

That which is yet further confirmed, for we read not that either Scotus, Frudegard, or Bertrame were euer condemned by the Church in their persons in anie Councell, or otherwise, which is an euidēt signe they were not obstinate in defence of their opinions, but onely deliuered their doubts by way of proposition, as at the least in Frudegard

in particular, doth manifestly appeare by the responsion of Pascasius to his Epistle, saying thus· *Quaris enim de re ex qua multi dubitant.* *You inquire of a thing of which manie doubt.* And for conclusion of his owne Epistle Pascasius saith to Frudegard. *Tu autem velim relegas libellum nostrum de hoc opere.* *For I would haue you read my booke of this matter which you say you haue read in tymes past. And if you reprehend, or doubt of anie thing in it: let it not be tedions vnto you to reuiewe it.* And finally towardes the end of his exposition of the wordes of the institution of the Eucharist, he speaketh to Frudegard in this manner. *Quapropter charissime.* *Wherfore most dearely beloued doe not doubt of this Mysterie which Christ the truth it self hath of him self bestowed vpon vs. For altho' he sits in heauen at the reight hand of his Father, yet doth he not disdaine to be Sacrifyced dayly by the preist in the Sacrament as a true hoaste.*

Now that the same Frudegardus doubt was onely whether the bodie of Christ contained in the Sacrament was the same bodie which he assumed of the Virgin Marie, is plaine by Pascasius answer saying thus almost in the beginning of his Epistle. *Ergo cum ait.* *Wherfore when he saith*

this

this is my bodie, or my flesh, or this is my blond. I think he intimated no other flesh then his owne propter bodie which was borne of the Virgin Marie and hanged on the Crosse. Nor anie other blond then that which was spilt vpon the Crosse, and which then was in his bodie. No man therfore which is soundly wise doth beleeue that Iesus had anie other flesh or blond then that which was borne of the Virgin Marie and suffered vpon the Crosse. And for conclusion of his foresaid exposition he saith thus to the same Frudegard. *Ad vltimum quæso te. Lastely I praye fallow not the fooleries of the triparti te or triple bodie of Christ. Doe not mingle salt, nor hunnie in it, as some would, doe not adde nor substracte anie thing, but beleeue and vnderstand it all as Christ institnted, &c.*

As for Scotus and Bertrame althou' their bookes haue ben reproued, yet it doth not fallow that their authors did directly and absolutely impugne the reall presence, or transsubstantiation, but they onely deliuered their myndes in a doubtfull, obscure, and ill sounding manner, for which cause and for auoyding of danger they were iustely prohibited, the onely the Councell of vercelles: the other by the *purgatorie Index*. Howbe it I find nothing in Bertram which with a pious interpretation might

not

not passe among the learned sorte of people.

And thus much may suffice for proofe that in Pascasius tyme ther had ben noplaine denyall of the reall presence or transsubstantiation in the Christian world, but onely some incident doubts made by some particular persons, and that in a discussiue manner, not as obstinate maintainers of such Doctrine.

And now by this same and the rest which I haue aboue produced out of the same Pascasius & Lanfrãc and others, the false Archbishop and Primate of Ireland is conuinced of an apparent falsitie, for that in the 79. page of his anser to a Iesuits chalenge, he had the face to affirme that til the dayes of Lanfranc this question of the reall presence coutinued still in debate: and that it was as free for anie man to followe the Doctrine of Bertram (he calles him Ratrannus) or Ioannes Scotus, as that of Pascasius. This audatious affirmation of vsher I say is clearly condemned of falsitie by the same Pascasius whome he citeth, and whoe as I haue alledged, testifyes that the doctrine of the reall presence in his tyme was not as yet contradicted by anie (except those whoe denye Christ) but beleeued and professed by the whole world, althou some,

saith

he did erre in the same by ignorance. And this onely by way of diuertion, breefly to signifye to the reader how common a practise it is euen among the most famous of our aduersaries to maintaine their doctrine by lyes and falſe dealing of which I perceiue by a breefe vewe I tooke of some parte of his worke an industrious reader may discouer no smale stoare in the great primate doctor Vsher, as well as his fellowes.

But now to returne to my direct purpose, I yet more efficatiously confirme that which I haue said of Alfric by the chronologie of our English historians. For first according to the computation of Bishop Godwin ther passed onely some six yeares betwixt the decease of wlstā in the archibishoprie of yorke, & the promotiō of S. Dūstan to the seat of Canterburiein which space, as likewise in the tyme of wulstan himself it is quite incredible that ther was anie doctrine cōtrarie to the reall ptesence cōmōly toucght in England, since S. Dunstan at the day and houre of his death expressely professed the same as out of our owne histories I haue alreadie showed by the relation of Harpesfeld.

In his catal. wulstan dunst.

Vid. Osbor ne in vita dunst.

Besides this it is certaine ther were but onely twoe wulstans Archbishops of yorke as appeareth by Godwins Catalogue: the

one as he reporteth deceaſed the yeare 955. which was at the leaſt fortie yeares before Alfric poſſeſſed the ſeat of Canterburie according to the account of the ſame catalogue. The other wulſtan as the ſame Goduin recounteth, l e3an not his ſeat at yorke till the yeares 1003. which was more then 50. yeares after the death of the firſt wulſtan. now this conographie being thus eſtabliſhed euen by one of our aduerſaries: I argue in this manner againſt knight Humbrey affirming that the homilie and Epiſtles which he alledgeth were tranſlated by Alfric, and appointed to be read to the people in his dayes, my argument is this.

Safe way. ſect. 9. §. 2.

If this ſuppoſed homilie, and Epiſtles were euer tranſlated, written, or publiſhed by Alfric, either it was when he was. Abbat, or Archbiſhop. But neither of theſe is true.

Therfore it is not true that the homilie and Epiſtles were euer tranſlated or publiſhed by Alfric.

The Minor which onely hath need of profe I conuince by the teſtimonie of my aduerſarie, whoe affirmes the tranſlation and publication of the freifaid writings to haue ben a boute the yare 996. and directed to wulſtan Archbiſhop or yorke and wulfſtius Bishop of sherborne by Alfric Abbat, I meane the Epiſtles. And yet at this tyme neither

Sir Humf. page 92.

neither was Alfric Abbat but Archbishop of Canterburie, neither was either of the two wulstans Archbishop of yorke at that tyme. the one being dead 40. yeares before, and the other not inuested in that dignitie vntill the yeare 1003. as Godwin doth witnesse. soe that by this argument it manifestly appeares that the knights relation touching this matter of the publishing of the homilie and Epistles alledged by him against the reall presence and transsubstantiation is contradictious & voyde of truth.

More ouer I finde in our English histories that aboute the yeare 950. which was some fortie and od yeares before Alfric was preferred to be Archbishop of Canterburie, in the tyme of Odo Archbishop of the same seat, ther were some conuented before him whoe were in an erroreous opinion aboute the presence of Christs bodie in the Eucharist, but the maintainers of it (how soeuer Fox doth fable) neither were manie, nor did it long continue, but was miraculously at an instant exstinguished. For the pious & zealous pastor Odo much lamenting the illusion of those miserable people, prayed God with teares in masse, that his diuine maiestie would be pleased by his infinit power manifestely to shewe *Vid. Harpf.*

some thing by which both the truth of the reall presence might appeare, and the contrarie error might be confounded, when sodainely at his seruants petition God almightie turned the consecrated bread into visible flesh, and the wine in to visible bloud. Which wonderous spectacle being seene, the incredulous persons presently complained of their owne perfidie and misbeleefe, and all the rest of their dayes conserued their faith intire and sounde: now this hauing happened aboute the same tyme at which that wulstan was Archbishop of yorke whoe hauing ben in that place some yeares: deceased the yeare 955. as Godwin relateth; it clearely appeares incredible that Alfric then Abbat should direct anie doctrine repugnant to the reall presence to wolstan Archbishop of yorke, and to vlsine, vlsius, or wulfstius Bishop of sherbourne, as our aduersaries affirme, since that Odo Archbishop of Canterburie and Primate of England, at the verie same tyme, as of out of histories I haue rehearsed, did by the power of God operate soe strange a miracle in confirmation of the same, and confutation of the contrarie error.

More then this, Vlsin or vlsius whome the knight calles wulfstius (of which name neuertheless I finde none in Malesburies Cato-

Catalogue of the Bishops of Sherbonrne) could not possible haue anie Epistle directed unto him by Alfric while he was Abbat of Malesburie or Abington, as Sir Humfrey and the rest of these tryfelers alledge, for that while Vlsine, or wulfstius was Bishop of Sherbourne which was but onely fiue yeares, as our histories doe testifye, being Abbat onely of westminister in the dayes of S. Dunstan and by his procurement, whose death happened the yeare. 988. as Stowe relates: Alfric was no more Abbat but Bishop of wilton, and consequently he could not as Abbat write to Vlsine, Vlsius, or wulfstius Bishop of Sherbourne, but if he had writ anie such letters as our aduersaries attribute vnto him, to that Bishop, he should haue styled him selfe not Abbat, but Bishop as in deed he was all the tyme yea and some yeares before the foresaid wulfstius was by king Ethelred preferred to the Episcopall seat of Sherbourne.

Hrapsfeld. sæc. 10. c. 9.

But that which doth strik this quite dead, is that (ther hauing ben but onely twoe wolstans Archbishops of yorke) the first wolstan dyed before euer Alfric was Abbat, to wit the yeare of our Lord 955. wher as Ingulphus in Edgar relates Alfric to haue ben created Abbat onely aboute the yeare 970. at the sooneste, soe that he

could not possible write anie Epistles to the first wolstan while he was Abbat asour nouellists pretend, bebause this wolstan was departed out of this life before Alfrics tyme of being Abbat. And as for the second wolstan it is well knowne and testifyed by Godwin that he was not Archbishop of yorke before the yeare 1003. At which tyme Alfric was not Abbat but Archbishop of Canterburie as our aduersaries them selues refuse not to graunte.

And soe this computation and collation of tymes vtterly destroyes the machination of our abuersaries in attrituting the foresaid writings to Abbat Alfric.

And touching Vlsius or Vlsinus I adde to this that Alfric was consecrated Byshop of wilton in the yeare 985. or ther aboutes some fourteeme yeares after the coronation of Ethelred. And he sate 11. yeares in that place as Malerburie relates. But now Vlsine as it appeares by a breef of Iohn the 15. Pope of this name touching the peace he composed betwixt king Ethelred and Richard marques of Normandie, was Byshop of Sherbourne aboute the yeare 991. of which yeare the Popes letter carieth date, in which althou the Pope doth not call him Vlsine, but Edelsine, yet both by the tyme and

lib. 1. de. Pont Ang. pag. 203.

and place of his seat, as alsoe for that ther is noe other in the Catalogue of the Bishops of Sherbourne yeare the after in which I finde related by Ingulpsus, Alfrics was Abbat of malesburie which resembleth that name, it is conuinced that this is the same man which the kinght calleth wulfstius, and to whome he affirmes one of Abbat Alfrics Epistles to haue ben directed. which neuersheleſſe is concluded to be false in regard that at that tyme of the date of the Popes Epistole to wit the yeare 991. Alfric was not Abbat but Bishop, this hauing happened but fiue yeres before that Alfric then Bishop of wilton, was assumpted to the Arcgbishoprie of Canterburie which was the yeare 996. as all agreeably testifye.

Now if our aduersaries should say that this Vlsius, Vlsine, or Edelsine is not that Bishop of Sherbourne to whome they meane that Alfric writ his Epistle, but an other long before him called wulfstius.

To this I replye, first that I finde not this name of wulfstius in anie author or Catalogue of the Bishops of Sherbourne, and soe I suspect it is a tricke of knight Hũfrey whoe as it seemes first inuẽted the name, supposing I finde it not in anie other either freide or for the name of anie Bishop of that *Westminst. an 940.*

It is true hiſtories make mention of one Vlſius Biſhop of that ſeat and ſucceſſor to Alfred, but neither the name agrees to knight Humfreyes feigned wulfſtius, neitheir was he then in the world when Alfric was Abbat, but according to the catalogue annexed to Ingulphus, deceaſed the yeare 966. For whoſe ſucceſſor the ſame catalogue putteth Alfwoldus. wheres yet it appeares by the teſtimonie of Ingulphus that Alfric was not Abbat till either in, or after the yeare 970. by which it is cleare he could not write to this vlſius or wulfſtius as Abbat, in reſpect he was dead ſome yeares before Alfric was preferred to that place by appointement of king Edgar. and ſoe this euaſion is intercepted by the way and appeares to be fruſtrate and falſe.

Further more according to Biſhop Vſhers chronologie affirming that Alfric writ his homilie aboute 605. yeares a goe Alfric ſhould haue writ the ſame the yeare 1026. or ther aboutes, deriuing the accoũte frõ the tyme of Vſhers publicatiõ of his booke; for ſoe by putting fiue or ſix yeares which I ſuppoſe hath paſſed ſince the tyme of Vſhers writing, to the 605. yeares which he aſſigneth for the tyme in which Alfric writ, & ioining to all this 1026. or 7. the whole nũber amountes iuſt to 1632. which is the yeare

yeare we now liue in. But this implyes impossibilitie in regarde it is receiued by both parties that Alfric dyed the yeare 1006. that is some 20. yeares before 1026. which Vsher assignes for the yeare of Alfric's writing the homilie by which it appeares that Primate Vsher is a most prime yea and a most vnmyndefull lyer in attributing this writing to Abbat Alfric. And concerning the writing of Alfrics twoe supposed Epistles, if Vsher meanes they were writ and directed to wulfsine and wulstane at this same tyme, he is likewise manifestly conuinced of falsitie, for that at the tyme assigned by him, ther was no vlsius, vlsine or wulfsine (as he nameth him) Bishop of sherbourne in the world to whome Alfric could haue directed anie writings, the last of that name being dead the age before as I haue shewed, as alsoe the first wulstan Arcbishop of yorke. True it is the second wulstan of yorke was then a liue to wit vnto the yeare 1023. but then Alfric being dead Archbishop of Canterburie (as I haue showed by Godwins Catalogue) almost 20. yeares before, the supposed direction of Epistles vnto him is euen in that respect concluded for repugnant and impossible with a plaine dissent of the author from him self as affirming the publication of these writings to haue

haue happened in the dayes of Alfric, & yet onely aboute 605. yeares agoe.

More ouer these relators agrees in their Chronographie like dogges and cattes, the partes of which hange togither as theeues hang vpon the gallowes neuer a one ioyning to an other. For as I haue said, Vsher affirmes Alfric Abbat's Saxon homilie to haue ben writen by him aboute 605. yeares which according to true computation considering the tyme in which Vsher writ this, comes to fall about the yeare 1020. But Sir Humfrey speaking of the same homilie, saith it was publikely appointed to be read to the people on Easter day aboute the yeare 996. at which tyme Alfric was not Abbat but Archbishop of Canterburie, as euen our aduersaries them selues doe relate: and soe these twoe brothers in Christ proceed not like brothers but repugne plainely one to an other in their accountes: the knight affirming the foresaid homilie to haue ben published & read some 24. yeares before Vsher alledgeth, it to haue ben written. Besydes this, Alfric dyed Archbishop of Canterburie the yeare 1006. according to Godwins Catalogue. How then could he possible write his homilie aboute 605. yeares agoe as Vsher tells vs? that is the yeare of our lord 1020. as I haue declared: except Alfric

In the 2. §. of the 9. sect of his safe way.

Godwin in Alfric p. 65

fric did miraculouſly riſe againe to broache the new Engliſh faith of the Euchariſt, which our aduerſaries will needs defende for ancient thou' it coſt them as deare as the forgeing of a falſe hiſtorie.

More ouer the publiſher of the ſame writings I meane the homilie and Epiſtles printed at London 1623. vnder the name of Alfric, telles vs, he writ them 700. yeares agoe in king Edga'rs tyme which falles iumpe with the yeare of Chriſt 923. if we counte from the tyme of the foreſaid publicatiõ of them. And yet as both Malesburie, Stowe, & the reſt of our hiſtorians teſtifye, Edgar was not created king vntill the yeare of our Souiour 959. ſoe that here is an apparent blurre in this wiſe Conographer's computation inuolueing both an impoſſibilitie in it ſelf, and a contradiction to the reſt of his companions in this buſines, whoe as I haue declared attribute them to Alfric in the tyme of Ethelred aboute ſome 600. yeares ſince, others ſome yeares before.

Laſtely Fox in his Acts and monuments althou' he doth not diſſent from his followes (excepting the fore ſaid late publiſſer) in his aſſignation of the tyme in which the homilie imputed to Alfric, is by them affirmed to haue ben propoſed for the inſtruction

ction of the people in England, viz. about the yeare 996: neuertheleſſe in two ſeuerall reſpects he proceedes moſt deceitefully and quite contrarie to common honeſtie, and reaſon. Firſt for that he feigneth and prefixeth a title againſt the reall preſence and tranſſubſtantiation to the ſaid homilie: ſecondly becauſe in his rehearſall of the tenor of the ſame, he leueth our the relation of two moſt manifeſt and palpaple miracles for the proofe of both thoſe points of the Catholique faith in it alledged by the author, which craftie and vulpine trickes of Fox (with which and manie others of like nature he farceth his huge volumes) as it appeares ſeemed ſoe ſhamefull that his ſucceſſor the late diuulger of the ſame homilie was aſhamed to imitate him: yea and not obſtanding he was bounde vnder paine of loſſe of the labor of his tranſlation and publication of that worke which otherwile he well conſidered would haue ben in vaine, to taxe the ſaid miracles of fiction (as he did in a marginall note) yet was he not ſoe impudent nor frontleſſe as to raze thē quite out of the copie. And how be it I cā not denye but ther is a great difference belweene theſe twoe actions, yet muſt they giue me licence to tell them

inexcuſable deceipt in Fox.

them that neither of them both is cleare of ill proceeding, the one being guiltie of plaine impoſture, the other of plaine temeritie. For ſuppoſing they would venture to make vſe of the homilie for the aduantage of their dēnyall of the reall preſence and tranſſubſtantiation, for all that, they ought to haue taken it as they founde it for better or for worſe, & not goe a boute to pick out what they finde for their purpoſe, and caſt a may the reſt, like ſuch vnreaſonable caterers as will needes buye fleſh without bones. And in deed thoſe twoe, bones that is thoſe twoe moſt patēt & cleare miracles by which both the reall preſēce of the bodie & bloud of Chriſt in the Euchariſt ar manifeſtly demonſtrated againſt the new doctrine of theſe our tymes, were too harde for old Father Foxs teeth to chewe, or for his ſtomake to diſgeaſt, therfore doubtleſſe he left them out both in his ſaxon and Engliſh tranſſumpte. But theſe ſycophants as they deale with the ſcriptures them ſelues, ſoe they deale with ancient authorities & teſtimonies. *Suo quidem priuilegione dicam ſacrilegio vt quod volunt accipiant, quod nolunt reijciant.* as S. Anguſtin ſaid of the Manichies. *lib. de bono perſon. c. 11.*

Againe concerning the Epiſtles attributed to Alfric ther is yet more diſcorde among our aduerſaries. For the publiſher of them

them and the homilie aboue mentioned in his preface vnto them affirmes ther were certaines lines rare zout of a booke extant in the librarie of worceter which lines, saith he, which contained the cheefe point of cõtrouersie (that is as he supposeth against the reall presence and transubstantiation) were taken out of twoe Epistles of Alfric written by him as well in the Saxon tongue as in the latin. But Doctor Iames and Sir Humfrey tell vs that the foresaid passage was razed in a latin Epistle manuscript of Bennitts Colledge in Cambrige yet there to be seene. And wheras the author of the publication saith that the lines razed ar to be restored by twoe other Epistles of the same Alfric in latin extant in the librarie of Exceter, contrarily D. Iames tolleth vs they ar to be restored not by anie latin copies, but by certaine Saxon copies of the same Epistles which he affirmeth to haue ben in the publike librarie of Oxon when he writ his booke which was the yeare 1611. Besydes this the same Iames out of Fox saith the Epistle which he affirmes to haue ben thus mangled and torne was to wulstan Archbishop of yorke and hath for title, *de consuetudine Monachorum*: wheras yet the foresaid publisher of Alfrics new founde writings, intileth that Epi-

Epistle of Alfric *de consuetudine monachorum* of the order or manner of monkes, *Egneshemensibus fratribus*, to the fryres or brothers of Egnesham. Which iarres I confesse I am soe vnable to compose that I can not but vehemently suspect these mens reportes to be false and counterfet. Especially considering that Iames affirmes the latin Epistle soe razed as they reporte, to haue ben directed by Alfric to that wulstan whoe was Archbishop of yorke aboute the yeare 954. wher as yet the author of the pamphlet in which these writings ar contained, in his prefate to the same, saith that this Alfric to whome he attributes them was equall to Alfric Archbishop of Canterburie which he alsoe affirmes to haue ben in that seat six yeares before that wulstan to whome Alfric's Epistle was writen, was Archbishop of yoke: soe that the one reportes this Epistle to haue ben wriren to the first wulstan and the other to the second not obstanding all histories and Cathologues of Bishops (among which is Godwins) doe testifye soe long a space of tyme to haue passed betweixt their standings, as it is from the yeare 955. and 1003. soe that these twoe relators drawe back warde and fore ward like twoe ill match asses.

More ouer the foresaid publisher will needs

needs haue Alfric the ſuppoſed author the homilie and epiſtles to haue ben a diſtinct man from that Alfric whoe was Archbiſhop of Canterburie wheras neuerſheleſſe Iohn Leland whoe profeſſedly writ of the writers of England relating the ſenerall workes of Alfric the Archbiſhop of Canterburie maketh noe mention of anie other writers of that name but of him onely, neither doth he put anie epiſtle among his writings but onely one intituled, *de conſuetudine Monachorum*, of the māner or cuſtome of monkes, which ſubiect how farre it diſagreth frō the preſence of Chriſts bodie in the Euchariſt, and tranſſubſtantiation, I leaue to the indgement of the reader to conſider.

In fine to conclude my whole diſcourſe touching this matter I ſay firſt, that if it were true as our aduerſaries pretend that in the foreſaid writings ther weere anie thing contained contrarie to the reall preſence and tranſſubſtantiation, yet haue I cōuinced by inſoluable reaſons that neither Alfric could be the author of them, neither could anie ſuch doctrine haue ben publikely maintained in the Church of England in or aboute his dayes. But what ſoeuer doctrine was then publiſhed and tought in our countrie was canformable in all points with

the

the doctrine and faith then professed in the Church of Rome with which the English Church and her Pastors had correspondence and subordination as I haue manifestly declared. Secondly Althou I am not able to iudge determinately whoe might be author of those writings becauſe I haue noe meanes to come to the view of them otherwise then in that patched and mangled manner in which they are publiſhed by our aduersaries: neuertheleſſe I perſuade my ſelfe they were writ by ſome Romane catholique author, ſoe that taken in their innocencie and prime puritie and piouſly interpreted they containe no vnſounde or erroneons doctrine, but rather expreſſe teſtimonie and proofes of diuers points controuerſed betwixt the nouelliſts of theſe our tymes and catholike Romaniſts. As appeareth in the mention they make of *maſſe, miracles, the ſigne of the Croſſe*, and other particulars which I haue noted in my cenſure.

Thirdly. the iudicious reader may eaſily perſuade him ſelf that ſuppoſing theſe writings according to the relation of our aduerſaries, haue remained in publike places and libraries for the ſpace of aboue 600. yeares, if they had cõtained anie doctrine repugnãt to that faith of the Euchariſt which I haue hiſtorically demonſtrated aboue to

haue ben profeſſed in our countrie of England euer ſince, and before, that tyme: its more then morally euident they would haue receiued long a fore this tyme reprehenſion, or cenſure according to their deſert.

Finally. Suppoſing it were true that the foreſaid writings did in deed containe doctrine contrarie to the reall preſence, and tranſſubſtantiation as they ar beleeued and defended by the profeſſors of the Roman Religion wheras yet they doe not ſoe, but onely exclude the carnal, palpaple or Capharnaitical preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, and inſtruct the people in the inuiſible preſence of his bodie, and bloude in the Sacrament in an obuius and eaſie māner: yet in reasō ought not anie iudicious Catholique to alter his faith of the ſame for anie argument which can be drawne or deduced from ſuch teſtimonie as is voyde of other credit then is to be giuen to aduerſaries in fauor of their owne cauſe which is iuſt none at all, eſpecially they being no other then theſe whoe not onely in this particular, but alſoe in other matters of controuerſie haue vſed much partialitie, & deceipt as in an other place I haue demonſtrated out of their ſeuerall wor-

workes. And in particular the publisher of the same pamphlet in which the homilie & Epistles of which I heare treate, are contained, besides diuers vntruthes which he vttereth as well touching the author and tyme of his writing, as alsoe his titles and marginall notes, and likewise in that he couningly and coufeningly publisheth in the same volume a treatise of the ould, and new testament in the name of Alfric as if it included a different canon of scripture to that which is now vsed in the Roman Church, and agreeable to their now English Bible: which is yet most apparently false for that (as I remeber) it putteth in the number and order of the Canonicall bookes Ecclesiasticus, Sapience, Tobie, Iudith and the Machabeis, which yet our aduersaries reiect for Apocryphal: As alsoe in that more ouer the same Pampheter addeth a testimonie to shewe that in tymes past the lords prayer, the creed and the ten commaundements were extant and vsed in the vulgar tongue; a worke most impertinently performed by him, and as it seemes onely or cheefely to enlarge the bulke and price of his pamphlet: it being certaine that the Romanists neuer neither held that matter vnlawfull, or at this present prohibit the

vse of the vulgar language for the ten commaundements and priuate prayer of the common people but rather the contrarie as both their Catechismes and their daylie practise most plainely witnesse.

By all which particulars and the rest of this my aduertisement it is euidently apparent that the glorious which the nouelists of our countrie make by their publication of the homilie epistles and o- writings in the name of Alfric, be no other then certaine prestigious impostures to persuade the simple sorte of people by these false florishes, that their deny all of the reall presence of the bodie and bloud of Christ in the Eucharist, and transsubstantiation is not quite voyde of antiquitie, but hath ben preached and professed in our countrie before the dayes of luther. And now let this suffice to repulse this fictitious and deceitefull calumniation of our aduersaries touching these putatiue wrings of Alfric by the publication of which and the like counterfeit wares they pick simple peoples purses whoe take all for as true as gaspell that is put in print by anie of their owne brothers.

The second aduertisement I giue to the reader is that wheras the kinght page 205. of his fafe wais cites Agobard for a denyer of

honor

honor of image in his booke of that ſubiect: I haue dilgently peruſed the ſame, and finde that in deed this author ſpeaketh more harſhely of this matter then anie other catholique writer of theſe dayes how be it this was the age in which images had their greateſt enimies. Neuertheleſſe it is moſt certaine this author onely confutes the exhibition of diuine honor and the like, vnto images, as is ſacrifice, or confidence in them or prayer vnto them: reprehending the error of ſome particular perſons whoe ſuperſtitiouſely adored them, for ſoe he diſcourſeth a boute the end of his booke ſaying.

Agobardus Epiſc. Lugdun. li. de pict. & imag.

But none of the ancient Catholiques *did euer thinke them to be worshiped or adored: yet now the error by increaſe is become ſoe perſpicuous that it is neare, or like to the hereſie of the Antropomorphits to adore figments and to put hope in them, and that by reaſon of this error faith being remoued from the harte, all our confidence be placed in viſible things.* And a little after. *Soe alſoe if we ſee penned or fethered Angels painted, the Apoſtles preaching, martyres ſuffering torments, we muſt not expect anie helpe from the pictures which we behould, becauſe they can neither doe good nor ill: rightly therfore* (theſe are the wordes cited by the kinght) *to euacuate ſuch ſuperſtition it was defined by orthodox Fathers that pictures ſhould not be made in churches leaſt that which*

si worshiped and adored be painted in the walles which wordes being not his owne but alledged out of a fragment of the Prouinciall councell of Eliberis in Spaine and hauing ioyned them immediately to his owne in which he onely treates of diuine honor as not due to images, it is cleare and euident he intendes to proue nothing elſe by their authoritie then that which he there propoſeth. To omit that this paſſage of the Eliberitan coūcell was deliuered in a ſenſe much different from this in which Agobardus conſtrueth it, as I haue conuinced in others places, and occaſions.

And that this author intendes to teache nothing elſe, but onely that images muſt not be honored with worſhip due to God, the ſeuerall teſtimonies which he largely produceth out of S. Auguſtin, S. Hierome, & other ancient writers doe manifeſtly demonſtrate, not one of which can be taken (if they be truely vnderſtanded) in anie other ſenſe, as clearely may appeare to the diligent reader of their wordes, which expreſſely exclude onely honor of Sacrifice, prayers directed vnto the images themſelues, or religion proper to God onely, in the worſhip of ſaincts, and their pictures: and alſoe Agobardus himſelf vppō occaſiō of the places which he citeth doth auerre,

plaine-

plainely declaring that he graunteth some sorte of honor to images wher thus he exhorteth.

Let vs behould the picture as a picture destitute of life, sense, and reason: let the eye be fed with this vision, but let the mynde reuerence God whoe both giues to his saints a crowne of victorie, and to vs the assistance of their intercession. And the like he affirmes of honor of saincts a little aboue in this same page. Wher althou' he iustely reserueth the supreame worship of Sacrifice to God a lone, yet he expressely grauntes an other inferior honor to Saints and Angels saying. *Adoretur, colatur, veneretur a fidelibus Deus, &c. Let God be adored, worshiped,* or serued, *and reuerenced by faithfull people, let Sacrifice be offered to him a lone, either in the mysterie of his bodie and blood, or in the Sacrifice of a contrite and humble harte, let Angels or holye men be loued, honored, with charitie, not with seruitude, let not Christs bodie be offered vnto them.* And according to this sense Agobardus speakes throu' his whole booke, particularly in his second leafe wher he reprehendeth certaine idolaters whoe imagined a certaine sanctitie to reside in images saying. *In which nature these also whoe call images holye, are founde not onely Sacrilegious for that they giue diuine worship to the workes of their handes, but also foolish in attributing sanctitie*

ctitie to images which haue no life or ſoule. By all which wordes it is cleare that Agobarde onely condemnes the exhibition of ſuch honor to ſaincts, or images as is due to God alone. Which doctrine is ſoe farre from being anie way contrarie to the honor of images practiſed in the Roman Church that it doth rather exactely agree with the honor of the Councell of Trent in this particular, which in the 25. Seſſion defines that, *due honor is to be giuen to images not becauſe it ſhould be beleeued that theris anie diuinitie or virtue in them for which they ar to be worshiped, or that anie thing ſhould be craued of them, or that confidence or hope ſhould be put in thē, as in tymes paſt the Gentiles did, whoe placed their hope in Idols, but becauſe the honor which is exhibited vnto them is referred to the prototypes or perſons which they repreſent. ſoe that by the images which we ſalute or kiſſe, and before which we vncouer our head, and proſtrate our ſelues, we adore and reuerence Chriſt, and the ſaints whoſe repreſentations or ſimilitudes they beare.*

True it is, I haue noted in reading his booke that Agobard purpoſely refuſeth to vſe theſe wordes *adorare, colere, adore*, or *ſeruе*: yet I plainely gather by his whole diſcourſe, he doth not ſoe to ſignifye ther by that images ar not to be vſed with anie honor at all, as I haue alreadie declared by his owne

owne text: but onely declineth the vſe of thoſe wordes in regarde he takes them in a ſtrict ſenſe, as they ſignifie religion or honor proper to God him ſelf, and not due to anie creature: and perhaps alſoe becauſe at that tyme as it may ſeeme by his nicenes, and ſome others of that age, the worde adoration was offenſiue euen to ſome whoe otherwiſe were both Catholique, and learned men: to ſay nothing of the common people ſome of whome peraduentute out of ignorance, and weakenes of iudgement, euen at this day make danger to vſe it, and ſcruple to heare it: yet neither the one nor the other omitting to honore images according to the approbation, and practiſe of the Church. Wheras yet if it be taken in the ſenſe in which the Roman Church, according to the definition of the 7. Synod and cuſtome of diuines, accepteth it, that is for a kynde of inferior honor diſtinct from proper latrie and religion, and as (euen according to the vſe of ſcriptures) it ſignifyes worſhip common alſoe to creatures, then doth it include no manner of ſcandall or offenſe at all.

Cumque introiſſet in conſpectu Regis. & adoraſſet eum pronus in terram &c. 3. Reg. 1. 24.

And now in that rigorous meaning Agobard takes the worde adoratiō when alledgeing the ſame wordes of the Eliberitan Councell which Sir Humfrey here reſearſeth,

seth, he intendeth onely to proue that images ar not to be adored or serued: in which passage he proueth nothing against the Roman Catholique honor of images, but onely disputeth either against some reliquies of the Antropomorphitan heresie: or against some other superstitious, and idolatrous adorers of Saints & images of those dayes, from both which kyndes of errors as Agobardus him selfwas, soe also the Roman Church with her cheefe Pastors and rulers (to which he then was a subordinate member, and prelate as other of his workes doe witnesse) were free and innocent as likewise now they be in this our present age not obstanding the frequent calumniations of our moderne sectaries to the contrarie.

Finally I adde to this that in the verie conclusion, and last period of his booke, Agobard expressely teacheth that genuflection is to be made to the name of Iesus, which yet our Puritan aduersaries out of their singular puritie, or rather pure singularitie, reiect as idolatrous, not obstanding by Gods commaundement, not onely men but deuils also ar enioyned, and compelled to bowe their knees at the sounde of that soueraine name. And surely he who holdes this for lawfull, as Agobardus doth,

doth, muſt for the ſame reaſous hold it likewiſe lawfull to honor the images of Ieſus, ſuppoſing that the name of Ieſus being to be honored onely for the repreſentation it hath of him, much more lawfully may his image be ſoe honored in regarde it doth more permanently and ferfectly repreſent him then doth his name which conſiſts in carracters, and a tranſitorie ſounde of letters. Beſides this, Agobardus as the verie firſt wordes of his booke doe declare, doth not directly and profeſſedly treate in it of the honor and vſe of images as it is practiſed in the church, but of the ſenſe of the firſt commaundement, in which he includes the prohibition of the adoration of images deliuered by God in the old Teſtament as a parte of the ſame, onely intending to proue in his whole worke that by virtue of this precept, diuine honor is not to be tendered to anie creature but to God alone, & not to either idoles or images.

And Therfore in his laſte page the ſame Agobardus expreſſely ſpeaketh of honor proper to God him ſelf, applying to his purpoſe the wordes of Iſaias *honorem meum alteri non dabo.* by all which it is moſt clearely apparent that what ſoeuer Agobarde ſeemes to vtter againſt the adoration of images, is onely ſpoken againſt ſuch as attributing

hæc est sincera religio hic mos Catholicus hæc antiqua patrum traditio &c. Agobardus fol. vlt. post authoritates Patr. citatus

ting ouer much honor vnto them worshipthe in an idolatrous, or superstitious fashion contrarie to the tradition of Fathers and practise of the Catholique Church as his wordes quoted in my margen sufficiently declare. And soe I leaue him as no enimie to the Catholique cause, nor anie fauorer of the disalawers of the same in this particular point, how be it the ambiguitie of his speech may giue occasion of error to ignorant, or ill affected readers.

To this I ioyne my responsion to the other wordes cyted by our aduersarie in the same place & out of the same booke of Agobardus as I suppose, for he ioynes them to the rest of those which ther he had. to wit these which followe. *Ther is nos example in all the scriptures, or Fathers for adoration of images. They ought to be taken for an ornament to please the sight, not to instruct the people.* To which I answer *in primis*, touching the former parte of the sentence, Agobardus hath no such expresse wordes as those; he onely saying thus: *the ancients also had the images of saint painted, or graued: but for remembrance not to worship them*: which wordes ar soma't different from those other rehearsed by sir Hum. neuertheless because they seeme to include a denyal of honor of images, I responde secondly, Agobard takes

kes

kes the wordes *colere & adorare* which ther he vſeth, in the ſame ſēſe in which he vſeth them in the reſt of his booke; that is for diuine honor as I haue aboue declared by ſeueral paſſages of the ſame. According to which acception his wordes ar verie true, nor anie way repugnant to the doctrine of the Roman Church either in thoſe dayes, or at this preſent tyme, which as in all former ages, ſoe in this in which we liue doth zealouſly deteſt, and abhorre as plainely idolatrous all diuine adoration of creatures, tho' neuer ſo eminent either in nature, or grace. Thirdly to the latter parte of the ſame ſentence, I ſay confidently, I am ſure ther ar no ſuch wordes in Agobardes booke euen as it is publiſhed and printed at Paris by Papyrius Maſſon him ſelfe, out of whoſe Bibliotheke be it good, or bad, ſir Humfrey produceth it: ſoe that I doe not vnderſtand this iugling for other then plaine forgerie, or fallification.

Fourthly, thoſe laſte wordes, *They* (images) *ought to be taken for an ornament to pleaſe the ſight, not to inſtruct the people*: ar iuſte contrarie to the doctrine of S. Gregorie teaching expreſſely that pictures ar the bookes of the illiterate, and ſimple people. Which doctrine of S. Gregorie, Agobarde was neither ſoe ignorant as not to knowe

it

it, nor yet ſoe impudent as to denyé it.

Fiftly, thoſe ſame wordes manifeſtly diſagree to the reſt of Agobardes owne doctrine, as his wordes by me related ſufficiently declare, partucularly thoſe: *Habuerunt namque & antequi magines ſanctorum ad recordandum &c.* Laſtely, Sir Humfrey muſt knowe that Papyrius Maſſon is regiſtred by the authors of our expurgatore Index, and conſequently, he is no current Romaniſt, and much leſſe is he anie of our beſt learned men as neither was Agobardus which ar yet thoſe whome he profeſſeth in the title of his booke to alledge againſt vs.

And ſoe by this, Agobarde is abſolutely cleared from all imputation of iconomachie or error againſt images, and the obiection of our aduerſarie conuinced to be voyde of force.

Furthermore touching that which the knight alledgeth out of Hincmar cõcerning the decree of the coũcell of Frãcfort a boute images, he deliuered it onely as a relator, & being young in yeares & vnexperienced he miſtooke the definitiõ of the foreſaid ſynod for the ſchiſmaticall determination of a priuate Cõuenticle, which hauing ben in the ſame place & at the ſame tyme, or preſetly after the diſſolution of the councell, he might eaſily take the one for

the

the other. In which historicall passage, as some authors opinate, by the credit he gaue to the supposed Carolin bookes, he both erred himselfe, & gaue occasiõ of error to others whoe relying vpõ his reporte haue put the same in their generall histories published since his tyme: yet this being onely a priuate error of fact and that vncertaine it was without anie preiudice to the faith and practise of Catholique Church

Besides it appeares euidently by an epistle of 55. chapters which the same Hincmare Archbishop of Rhemes writ to his aduersarie Hincmare Bishop of laon, he was a verie pious & Cotholiq; prelate & an ackowledger of the Popes supremacie ouer the rest of the Christiã Churches Greek & Latin, for soe he speakes in Hie fift chapter of that worke. *qui in illius* (Sedis Apostolicæ) *primatu beatus Petrus cunctorũ onera portat, cuius principatus authoritate mediator Dei & hominum homo Christus Iesus sedem Romanam super omnes sedes sublimauit, Alexandrinam decorauit, Alexandrinam confirmauit* &c. wherfore it is improbable that Hnicmare who speaketh soe honorably of the Romã Church, should at the same tyme haue vttered anie doctrine soe contrarie to the then receiued practise of the same, as is contained in those wordes viz. Images ar to be taken for an

ornament

ornament to pleaſe the ſight not to inſtruct the people.

To this I adde for confirmation of my anſer, it is not crediltle to imagine that ther hauing paſſed diuers letters betwixt Pope Adrian (in whoſe tyme due honor of images was defined againſt the oppoſers of it) and other Popes of thoſe tymes, and this Hincmare, for compoſing the controuerſie betweene him and Biſhop Hincmare of Laon, as alſoe aboute other matters; it is not credible I ſay thoſe Popes ſhould not once haue reprehended and condemned him for this poſition, if truely he had ben a maintainer of it Beſides the Eccleſiaſticall hiſtories doe teſtifye that aboute the ſame tyme, this ſame Hincmar at the perſuaſion of Pope Nicolas confuted the criminations of the Grecians againſt the Roman Church, of whome he would neuer haue made choiſe for ſuch a buſines, if he had ben either knowne or ſuſpected to haue defended anie doctrine repugnant to the vſe and honor of images eſtabliſhed in the 7. Synod and then commonly practiſed in the Chriſtian world.

And thus we ſee that nothing produced by our aduerſarie out of this author repugneth to the doctrine of that moderate honor of images which hath ben vniuerſally pro-

profeſſed in the Roman Church both in the tyme of Agobarde and in this preſent age.

My third aduertiſſement is that the knight in the 289. page of his ſafe way iniuriouſly accuſeth Charon for a blaſphemer of ſcriptures alledgeing him to affirme they ar imperfect, obſcure, doubtfull, ambiguous, perplexed. And yet I finde that this author in his thrid booke *de tribus veritatibus* (which is the ſame our aduerſarie cites althou' not in the ſame language) page 97. 98. and the reſt imediately following in his french edition (for I could not haue him in latin) expreſſely cleares him ſelfeand Roman church of that foule and odious calumniation feigned by Pleſſis in their diſgrace. Charons wordes ar theſe. *Venons aus particularitez qu'ils nous font dire, encore qu'ils les propoſent mal, & autrement que nous ne le diſons, pour nous rendre odieux: premierement que nous le diſons l'eſcriture eſte imperfecte: au contraire nous la croyons, confeſſons & proſchons, perfecte, pleine, entiere, tres-ſuffiſante come eſtant oeuure de Dieu, du quel ne ſorte rien qui ne ſoit tel. Parquoy tout ce que Du Pleſſis dict, ſcauoir eſt qu'elle eſt perfecte, ſuffiſante, a ſalut que IESV ſon autheur eſt la perfection, c'eſt en vain. car cela a eſte enſeigne par nous deuant luy: & ne fut iamais dict par les Catholiques choſe au contraire. quant*

a l'obſcurité, doubte, ambiguite, nous n'en parlons pas de tout ſi cruement, mais nous diſons bien franchement deux choſes, & l'auons aſſes dict & monſtré cy deſſus, que l'ſcriture eſt fort difficile a entendre: qu'elle eſt priſé & employee de touts indifferemment bons & mauuais en caution & defenſe de toutes opinions, & a la ruine de pluſieurs.
Thes ar Charons expreſſe wordes which I engliſh in this mãner. *Let vs come to particulars, wich they make vs ſpeake althou' they propoſe thẽ wrong, and otherwiſe thẽ we vtter thẽ to make vs odious: firſt that we ſaye the ſcriptures ar imperfect; on the contrarie wee beleeue, confeſſe, and preache them to be perfect, compleat and entire, ſufficient, as being the worke of God, from whome nothing proceeds which is not ſuch, for which cauſe al that which Pleſſis ſaith viz. that the ſcripture is peafect, ſufficient to ſalnation, that Ieſus the author of it, is perfection it ſelfe, is in vaine. For that hath ben taught by vs before him: neither was anie thing to the contrarie euer ſpoken by the Catholiques. For as much as concernes, obſcuritie, doubtfulnes, ambiguitie, we doe not ſpacke altogither ſoe crudely or rawly, yet we ſay freely twoe things of which we haue ſufficiently ſaid, and demonſtrated them before, that the ſcripture is verie hard or difficult to vnderſtand: that it is taken and applyed by euerie one indifferently good and bad in caution and defence of all opinions, and to the ruine of manie.*

This

This is that I finde in this author to this purpose, which how repugnant it is to our aduersaries purpose the reader can not be iguorant except he be affectedly ignorant as the knight seemes to be euen in this particular, onely this excuse I conceiue he may haue, if it be as I persuade my selfe, to wit that trusting to that pitt of corruption Plessis, he deliuered this passage to vs by retaile as he receiued it from him which if he did I shall not beforie, for that I desire not to charge my opposites more then I must of necessitie: neither is ther anie need of amplification in that nature, where the matter is soe copious, and aboundante.

Touching Christophorus de cap. fontiū alledged by Sir Humfrey in the 108. page of his safe way for a denyer of transsubstantiation althou' I haue said something alreadie in the place cited it selfe: yet hauing since had a seight of that authors worke against the sacramentaries, I haue further discouered he is falsely and with manifest iniurie to his person produced by our aduersarie, supposing he is soe farre from vttering anie doctrine against either the reall presence or transsubstantiation, that he professedly defendeth them both in his foresaid treatise, in which particularly touching transsubstantiation I finde these plaine wor-

des, in the 58. chapter of his fourth Action. *Transſubſtantiationis articulum verbi Dei authoritate probaturi, illud in primis tanquam baſim ac fundumentum immobile ponimus, hæc Chriſti verba (hoc eſt corpus meum) in literali ſenſu eſſe veriſſima, proinde ſupernacaneum ne dicam impium eſſe hæc ita deprauare, detorquere, mutare, vt & corpus in corporis figuram, & verbum eſt in ſignificat, conuertatur, quaſi hæc ſententia alioquin vera eſſe, ſibique niſi ad hunc modum mutata conſtare non poſſit, dicimus igitur ſingula dominicæ ſententiæ verba in ſua naturali ſignificatione ſumenda eſſe. Hoc ita cõſtituto vt verborum Chriſti veritas conſtet, primum neceſſariò conſequens eſſe dico vt panis eſſentia conuertatur & mutetur.* We being (ſaith Chriſtophorus) to proue the article of *tranſſubſtantiation* by authoritie of the diuine worde, *In primis* we put it were for an immoueable foundation or graunde worke that theſe wordes of Chriſt (*this is my bodie* are moſt true in a literall ſenſe for which cauſe it is I will not ſay impious, but at the leaſt ſuperfluous ſoe to detorte, deprane, and change them, that the worde bodie be changed into a figure of his bodie, and the verbe is into ſignifye as if this ſentence could not other wayes be true and hang togither, vnleſſe it be altered in this manner. Wherfore we ſay that euerie worde of our lordes ſentence is to be taken in their

naturall

naturall ſignification. This being thus eſtabli-ſhed, to the end that the trueth of Chriſts wordes may ſtand firme, I ſay firſt that it is neceſſarily conſequent that the eſſence of bread be conuerted and changed &c. Thus clearely ſpeaketh the Archbiſhop, which if perhaps it be not ſufficient to conuince our aduerſarie that this author was noe denyer of tranſſubſtantiation, let him but take a breefe view of his booke, and he will be ſure to finde both that point and the reall preſence moſt exactely and copiouſly proued by ſuch a multitude of teſtimonies both of ſcriptures and ancient Fathers, as I knowe he will not be able to looke vpon them without confuſion.

It is true I muſt confeſſe this author, in his firſt Action of this worke, hath broached an extrauagant opinion touching the wordes of conſecration, for which cauſe principally as I ſuppoſe the expurgatorie Iudex prohibiteth his booke till it be corrected. for in his 264. and 265. pages he endeuoreth to proue that preiſts doe not conſecrate by virtue of thoſe wordes *hoc eſt corpus meum*: but by virtue of thoſe, *hoc facite in meam commemorationem*. In confirmation of which his opinion althou' he diſcourſeth in an vnaccuſtomed manner among deuines both ancient and moderne, yet ha-

uing diligently conferred one of is paſſages with an other and duely pondered the whole ſenſe and meaning of them, I perceiue his intention was onely to diſpute againſt and diſproue thoſe whoe hould that by the virtue and operation of theſe wordes (*hoc eſt corpus meum*) onely materially and literally accepted & pronounced the conſecration is performed, he him ſelfe earneſtly contending that thoſe wordes haue their virtute & force from the precept Chriſt (*hoc facite in meam commemorationem*. And therfore in his page 263. where he ſtateth his queſtion he hath theſe wordes fellowing. *permulti ſunt qui horum verborum (hoc eſt corpus meum) materialiter pronunciatorum operatione ac virtute conſecrationem fieri putant, Vnde nonnullos equidem vidi qui cum ad conſecrationem peruentum eſſet, miris modis halitum ſuum cum dictis iam verbis, ſuper panem & vinum conijcerent, non ſecus ac ſi & in quantum nuda tantumuodo verba ſunt, nihil aliud in ipſis conſiderando, conſecrationem fieri arbitrantur. Ego vero conſecrationem horum verborum operatione (hoc facite in meam commemorationem) fieri exiſtimo. Chriſtus enim &c.* There be verie manie (ſaith this author) who think that conſecration is made by virtue and operation of theſe wordes (this my bodie) materially pronounced. Whence it is that I

haue

haue ſeene ſome whoe comeing to conſe-
crate doe in a ſtrange manner caſt their
breath with the foreſaid wordes vpon the
breade and wine as if in as much onely as
they be naked wordes, not conſidering
anie thing elſe in them, they did hould con-
ſecration to be performed by them. But I
think that conſecration is made by virtue
and operation of theſe wordes, *doe this in
rembrance of mee. For Christ &c.* By which
wordes it clearely appeareth that Chriſto-
phorus did not abſolutely denye that
preiſts doe conſecrate by theſe wordes,
this is my bodie; but he onely affirmeth that
they haue not their conſecratiue virtue or
force included in their owne materiall
ſounde, but receiue it from the precept of
Chriſt contained in thoſe other wordes of
his *Doe this in remembrance of mee.*

That which I yet further conuince by o-
other wordes of the ſame author in this ſa-
me Action wher thus he diſcourſeth in con-
firmation of his poſition. *Nemo proinde ex-
iſtimet hæc verba hoc eſt corpus meum tech-
nice & materialiter prolata conſecrationem
efficere, ſed ipſius Sacerdotis orationem (in
qua & hæc ipſa recitantur) mandati huius,
hoc facite, virtute atque operatione irrogatam
ac ſpirituali virtute roboratam.* Let noe man
therfore think (ſaith hee) that theſe

wordes (*this is my bodie*) artificially and materially pronounced doe make the conſecration, but the prayers of the preiſt (in which theſe ſame wordes alſoe are recited) proceeding from the virtute and operation of this precept *doe this*, and ſtrenthened by virtue of the ſame. Thus Chriſtophorus. By which it is manifeſt he had noe intention to denye theſe wordes, *this is my bodie* to be them by which preiſts doe conſecrate ſince he expreſſely affirmes that they are included and rehearſed among thoſe prayers, benedictions and gratiarum actions, by which, according to his tenet, they dayly conſecrate: But he onely in his owne priuate opinion houldes, that as well thoſe wordes (*this is my bodie*) as the reſt of the prayers which the preiſts vſe, haue their virtue and efficient force of conſecration not from their owne materiall ſounde, but from the precept of Chriſt, *doe this in remembrance of mee.* Which altho' as it hypothetically or totally ſoundes, it is an extrauagant and ſingular placet or dictamen of his, yet is it not repugnant to the Catholique Roman faith, either in the point of the reall preſence, or tranſſubſtantiation, as may plainely appeare to anie iudicious reader: But onely hath ſome affinitie with the tenet of the moderne

Gre-

Grecians in this particular; whoe not obstanding constantly defende both the one, and the other, as I haue shewed in an other place by the doctrine of their late Patriarch in his responsion to the lutherans.

And now I hence inferre as a thing more directly for my purpose that the wordes which Sir Humfrey produceth against transsubstantiation out of a certaine treatise intuled de Correctione Theologiæ Scholasticæ, are not truely the wordes of this author; But that Treatise is falsely ascribed vnto him and forged in his name how soeuer our aduersaries make great estimation and vse of it: That which I clearely demonstrate becaus it containeth doctrine repugnant to that which he himselfe teacheth in his owne vndoubded worke against the Sacramentaries. For wheras according to the citation of the knight in his 108. page of his safe way, in his Treatise inscribed de correct. Theol. Schol. Christophorus hath these wordes: Therfore it most certaine that Christ did not consecrate by those wordes (this is my bodie) neither ar they anie parte of consecratiõ. And yet in his Treatise against the Sacramentaries he directly affirmeth the contrarie saying thus *Christus enim horum verborum (hoc est corpus meum)*

meum) vi & operatione consecrationem confecit: panis natura in verum ipsius corpus sese mutante &c. Which is in English. Christ did consecrate by virtue and operation of the wordes (this is my bodie) the nature of the bread being changed or changeing it selfe in to his bodie &c. Now it is plane that these wordes plainely contradict the other rehearsed by our aduersarie, these directly and expressely affirming that Christ did consecrate by these wordes (this is my bodie) the other directely and expressely denying the same. In soe much either we must of necessitie grante that the Archbishop plainely contradicted him selfe, which is not to be admitted especially in a graue & learned diuine as he was: or else that the Treatise in which is soe expressely contained a denyall of that same which the same author affirmeth in his owne knowne & acknowledged worke, is not truely his, but falsifyed and falsely published in his name. and consequently what soeuer our aduersarie produceth out of it proueth nothing, but is to be registred in the list of such other cõterfeit wares as he selleth to his reader for currẽt in the rest of his worke. And touching his Treatise against the sacramẽtaries & some other of his workes althou they cõtaine some extrauagant positions and therfore

were

were iuſtely condemned to be expurged by the authors of the Iudex, yet becauſe particularly in his booke againſt the denyers of the reall preſence, the author expreſſely ſubmitteth his doctrine to the cenſure of the Roman Church purpoſely placeing in the frontiſpice of his booke, *omnia ſanctæ Eccleſiæ Catholicæ ac ſanctæ ſedi Apoſtolicæ Romanæ iudicio ſubmiſſa ſancto*, therfore his authoritie can not anie way preiudice the Romanfaith. And now let this ſuffice to shewe the falſitie of this citation: onely the reader muſt further ſuppoſe that if I had ſeene the Treatiſe it ſelfe I could haue cleared the matter more exactely: But our aduerſaries take an order for that keeping cloſſe all ſuch obſcure workes and reſeruing them for their owne pallates as great nouelties and moſt daintie diſhes.

Some fewe more authors remaine vnexamined by reaſon I could not haue them: as Cardinal Carapha. Ioãnes Marius, & twoe or three others. But I aſſure the reader the allegations drawne out of them by my aduerſarie containe no matter of importance which is not ſufficiently cleared without anie further ſearche of the places as they ſtand in the bookes. Onely this inconuenience ther is in this matter viz. That if I had obtained a ſight of the authors thẽ ſelues,

ues, I ſhould probably haue diſcouered ſome more of the alledgers ill proceding. In reſpect of which, and my other more triuial defectiuenes. I will vſe the ſame excuſe which S. Auguſtin hath for a certaine worke of his, concluding thus. *Si quid ab eis dici ſolet quod forte diſputando non attigi, tale eſſe arbitratus ſum, cui mea reſponſio neceſſaria non fuiſſet, ſiue quod tam leue eſſet, vt a quolibet redargui facillime poſſet.*

3 0062

AN APPENDIX TO THE VVHETSTONE, OR A COMPENDIOVS ANSER TO THE BY-WAY, CHEEFLY

consisting in a breife discouery of the authors indirect, partiall, & false dealing with a detection of some particular examples of falsification.

BY THE SAME AVTHOR.

Sicut nouacula acuta fecisti dolum. Psal. 51.

CATVAPOLI,
Apud viduam MARCI WYONIS.
Anno M. DC. XXXII.

AN

APPENDIX

TO THE

WHETSTONE,

OR

ACOMPENDIOVS ANSER

TO THE BY-WAY. CHEEFLY

BRITISH MUSEUM

BY THE SAME AVTHOR.

GATVAPOLI,

Apud viduum MARCI WYONIS.

Anno M. DC. XXXII.

THE INTRODVCTION TO THE APPENDIX.

BY that tyme I had in a manner finished my censure of knight Humfreyes nicnamed false way, I receaued sodaine newes of another way, eyther of the same author or of his frend for him, which like a second parte of the Pickro came ruffling out with a greater noyse then the first: & the reason is as I suppose as well for that it carrieth a more extrauagant title to wit *via deuia*, as also in regard it is some what larger both inleaues, & as I thinke in lyes.

Why the author should call his firste booke *via tuta* or the safe way; & this *via deuia* or the by way rather then the contrarie, in my conceit few will be able to imagine anie other reason then his owne knightlie pleasure: &

for my part I muſt needes confeſſe that his ti-
tles ſeuerallie applied to the contents are to me
meere riddles, as not conteyning eyther expli-
citlie or implicitlie that which they make
showe of, but rather ſtanding onelie for cy-
phers or markes of the authors affected follie
promiſing much but performing nothing, as I
haue made appeere in part by myne anſere to
his firſt worke, & partlie alſo ſhall be showed
by Gods aſſiſtance in this againſt which I now
write; of which altho' I doe not intend to
make anie fotmall confutation in euerie parti-
cular point of doctrine as I did before, more
then once repenting my ſelfe that I ſpent ſo
much time vpon ſuch idle matter: yet will
I make a breife ſuruey of euery diſtinct ſection
principallie noting & notifieing to the reader
ſuch faultes as I ſhall finde the author guiltie
of, whome I alſo aduertiſe that notobſtanding
the knight with theſe his two bookes as it
were with the deliuerie of two prodigious
twinnes, would ſeeme to haue brought forth
ſome great & ſtrange noueltie to the world:
yet in veritie there is nothing of moment alle-
ged by him eyther in this or in his former trea-
tie, eyther out of ſcriptures, Councells, or Fa-
thers, which hath not binne long ſince exami-
ned & confuted by a greater & farre more
learned number of Catholike diuines then all
the pretenſiue reformed Churches can affoord

as

as apposers of the Roman doctrine. And altho' I doe ingenuouslie confesse that Sir Humfrey hath vsed no smale art & industrie in the application of his predecessours labours to his owne intent & purpose; neuertheless he hath performed the same in such a cousening & deceitfull manner, that the reader may assure himselfe t'is almost one & the same labour to discouer his lyes, equiuocations, false suppositions, impertinent & corrupted allegations, & other his insincere dealing, & to confute his doctrine, it being little more then a masse or compound of those & the like corrupted & vitious ingredients, nor contayning anie graue or solid discussion of anie one question *in terminis* or professedlie, but onelie or cheiflie consisting in a certaine abstractiue way by compacting patches & shreads of furtiue & stollen diuinitie deliuered in a plausible & persuasiue manner: of which altho' I doe not denie but the author hath receiued great parte at the second hand from his anteceſſors, especiallie from his great Patron Daniel Chamier who in the art of cheating doth in my opinion eyther exceed or at the least equalize anie that euer writ before him; in regard of which altho' the knight might seeme in some sort excusable at the least by ignorance: yet hath he or his chaplins inuented & added so much in that nature of his owne coyning, that I doe not see

what coulourable excuse can possiblie be alleaged for iustification of his bad proceedings. And when reading of Bellarmines bookes of controuersies I found so manie vntruthes, falsifications, & corruptions, by him discouered out of Luther, Caluin, Beza, Brentius, Kemnitius, & other sectaries who had writ before him, I imagined that, at least, for, verie shame their successors as being such great professors of reformation would haue reformed themselues in that kinde; but now of late since I came to read the workes of Daniel Chamier & Sir Humfrey Lind, I professe I haue quite lost my hope of their reclamation, especiallie reflecting that as they are all men of one profession, & haue all of them an ill cause to maintaine, so are they all fallen into a fatall necessitie of abusing their readers with trickes & sleights: the reason of which is plaine, in regard that falsehood as being of a contrarie nature to truth it cannot possibly be defended & patronized by the same truth, but must of necessitie be defended by it selfe. And as for Sir Humfrey he is so deepelie plundged in that muddie ditch, that he & his honour are like to lye there for euer, his ill custome being now almost turned into nature, & as proper to him as blacke is to an Ethiopian, or white to a Swanne.

And to proceed to particulars, he is so voyde of shame that he doubtes not to abuse Bellarmine

mine in the very frõtiſpice of his booke, where for poſye or ſentence of the ſame, he putteth certaine words of his taken out of his firſt booke *de verbo Dei cap.* 2. intending by this indirect meanes to perſwade his readers that the contents of his whole worke haue that famous Cardinall for their patron & approuer, which in my iudgmẽt is a point of the greateſt couſenage & impudency that euer was heard of among Chriſtian writers; ſince that neither that which Bellarmines words import containe the whole, or yet the cheife drife of Sir Humfreys booke, neither are they vttered by him in that ſenſe in which he doth apply them, to wit that the ſcriptures are the ſole rule of faith, & that there is no other rule but onely them: wher as Bellarmin onely affirmeth that the ſcriptures are a moſt certaine & a moſt ſafe rule in caſe they be rightly interpreted & according to the ancient tradition of the Church, & that they are not to be neglected by imbracing the priuate ſpirit, which is fallible & vncerteine, & to be relyed vppon by none but ſuch as neglect the certaintie or ſafe way of ſaluation, in which ſenſe & meaning how the wordes of Bellarmine can poſſibly be applied to Sir Humfreys *Deum* or *by way*, let the indifferent reader iudge, eſpecially conſidering that he could not be inuincibly ignorant that the learned Cardinall in another place plainly declareth

Vid. li. 1. de verb. Dei c. 2. & l 3. de verb. Dei c 1. & ſeq. Scriptura regula credendi certiſsima tutiſsimq; eſt ſupra. *Lib 4 de verbo Dei cap. 12.*

reth himselfe touching the totallity & partiallity of the rule of faith, where yet nothing is to be found in that sense which the knight fraudulently framed to his owne purpose.

And now from hence I passe to the Epistle dedicatory, on which I had scarce cast myne eyes, when presently I discouered two or three slanderous lyes vttered by the author: the firste is, that the pretended Catholike Church as he phraseth her, is made the whole rule of faith by the Romanists: the second, that the Romane Catholikes are tought to eate their God & kill their King: the third that the Pope at this day alloweth of the Iewes Talmud & inhibiteth the bookes of Protestants. And those vntruthes I haue noted onely, not for that I could not haue marked out others, but because they seemed the most obuious grosse & palpable. I omit also to specify diuers places of Bellarmine cited by Sir Humfrey both heere & in many other partes of his worke, which well examined can serue him for no other purpose thē to coulore his cousinage.

And as for the rest of his preface, I can assure the reader, it is little more then an idle & tedious repetition of the same matters which he handled in his firste booke: and whosoeuer will take the paines to read both his pamphlets wil find so frequent rehersall of the same things that his eares will tingle to heere them; nay some whole chapters of this booke there

bee, which excepting the title haue little other matter then the same which is found in the other, as will appeere in parlicular to him who shall conferre the two last sections of it with the tenth & eleuenth sections of the safe way; In so much that I thinke I may not vnfitly say of the workes of Sir Humfrey that which a certaine pleasant wit sayd once of the writings of Luther, *Tolle contradictiones, calumnias, mendacia, dicteria, ac schommata scurillia in Catholicos Romanos, inanes digressiones, ambages, atque inutiles verborum multiplicationes, & duo eius volumina in vnum haud magnum libellulum redigi posse non dubito*: that is, take way Sir Humfreys contradictions, calumniations, & lyes, take away his scoffes, & iestes against the Romane Catholikes, his idle & vaine digressions, & multiplication of wordes, or repetition of matter, with his friuolous circumlocutions, & I doe not doubt but both his volumes may be easily reduced to the bulke of one small paphlet. And thus much concerning the Preface & the booke in generall, from whence I passe to particulars.

The discvssion of the several sections in their order.

In his first section, I thinke I may trulie say Sir Humfrey telleth but one vntruth, but it is so lardge a lye that it reaches from end to end, Sec. 1.

end, I meane but one totall lye, for partiall lyes there are diuers. This totall vntruth is in that he affirmeth in his second page, that the difference betwixt vs & them, is such as was betwixt S. Augustine & the Donatists, which is manifestly conuinced to be false euen by those same words which he himself cites out of that holy doctor, who directly sayth that the question betweene him & them was *vbi sit Ecclesia?* where the Church is? And yet the question is not betwixt the Romanists & the Reformers where the true Church is, but which is the true Church? that is, whether the Romane church & all the rest of the particular Churches in the world adhering to & obeying that Church as the cheife & mother Church be that true Catholike Church mentioned in the Creed & commended in the scriptures, or the reformed Church or Churches whersoeuer they be? which the reader may plainly perceaue to be a farre different question, from that of which S. Augustine speaketh in the place cited by the kinght. Secondly the whole discourse of this section runneth vpon a false supposition to witt that the Romanists refuse to proue the truth of their Church by scriptures onelie, as S. Augustine did, saith the kinght, against the donatists; but this is not true, for the Romanists are so farre for reprouing that course in this point, that they scarce vse any other

Aug. de vnit. Eccl. cap. 2.

proofes

proofes then thoſe ſame ſcriptures which the ſame S. Auguſtin ordinarily vſeth for that purpoſe, as may be ſeene in the workes of both ancient & moderne diuines.

Thirdly neuertheles when the Romaniſts ſay they proue the truth of their Church by ſcriptures onely, they doe not therfore meane ſo that they exclude the interpretation of them according to the ancient tradition of the ſame Catholike Church; for ſo neither S. Auguſtine eyther againſt the Donatiſts or any other hereticks in the like caſe, alleaged the ſcriptures, but as the ſame Saint Auguſtine ſaith thou partly in different wordes & to another purpoſe, *vt non niſi verum ſenſum & Catholicum teneamus*, not ſo but that we doe followe the true & Catholike ſenſe of the ſame ſcriptures. And in fewe wordes that which the Romaniſts meane is, that they doe not vſe the ſcriptures for proofe of their Church in the ſenſe of the pretenſiue reformed Churches, but onerly in that ſenſe which anciently hath binne imbraced by the moſt vniuerſally floryshing Church in all or moſt ages according to the diuerſity of tymes. *De vnit. Eccleſ. c. 19.*

And thus we ſee cleerlie that Sir Humfrey in diuerſe reſpects hath groſſelie & ignorantlie miſtaken the ſtate of the queſtion both betwixt S. Auguſtine & the Donatiſts, & alſo betwixt himſelfe & the Romaniſts. And conſequent-

ſequentlie thoſe aurhorities which he produ-deth eyther out of S. Auguſtine or other ancient Fathers are impertinent & of no force againſt the faith of the Romane Church: but on the contrarie by his falſe dealing he hath fallen into that by path which in his erroneous imagination he hath prepared for his aduerſaries; in which neuertheleſſe he himſelfe if he proceed in this manner is like to walke euen to the end of his iorney, I meane throu' all the ſections of his booke.

In his ſecond ſection he pretends to anſere to the pretences, as he termeth them, taken by the Romaniſts from the obſcuritie of ſcripture, & from the inconueniences which he ſaith his aduerſaries alleage for the reſtraint of the lay peoples reading them, yet he is ſo farre from performing his taske in this behalfe that he doth not ſo much as relate completelie thoſe reaſons which moue the Romã Church to ordayne the ſaid reſtraint, but onelie catching at one or two of the leſſe important cauſes alleaged by Bellarmin to that purpoſe, & giuing a verie ſleight & ſuperficiall anſere vnto them, he ſpends a great part of his time in forging a new cauſe which he falſelie conceiueth to haue binne the onelie or cheife motiue which the Roman Church had to prohibite the reading of the Bible; to wit for feare, as he ſayth, *their Trent doctrine & new articles*

Sec. 2.

ſhould

should be discouered, And also in breathing out an odious relation of the speaches of some particular Romanists touching the inconueuiences which that libertie which the Nouellists haue giuen to the common people in reading the scriptures, hath caused in the Christian world in these our present times, as that to permitt euerie ignorant man or woman without distinction or order to read them is to cast pearles before hogges, & the like, which because thy are both impertinent in this place, as also for that I haue in parte ansered them in my censure, I omit to reherse them: that which in like manner I doe for the same reason in the rest of the authors which the knight citeth in this section, onelie aduertising the reader that besides that they make not to the purpose, diuers of them are by him corruptedlie alleaged & mangled either in wordes or sense, or rather both in words & sense, as particularlie may appeere in the citation of Sanders whome our aduersarie affirmes to say that it is little better then heresie to translate the scriptures, & yet Sanders onelie sayth that it is an heresie if one doe affirme it is necessarie for scriptures to be translated into vulgar tongues, as the same words which Sir Humfrey cites doe testifie.

Period. 13. & alibi.

By Way page.

Haresim esse si quis dicat esse necessariũ. vis mon. Hær. 191.

Heal so abuseth Acosta whome he cites lib. 2. de Christo reuel. cap. 2, & yet Acosta speakes not a word of reading scriptures in vulgar

gar language, & much leſſe affirmes that much profit may redound to the lay people by reading them in theſe our daies, eſpeciallie in that manner as the knight falſelie alleageth, who if he will proue his intent muſt needes ſpeake in that ſenſe when he impoſeth vpon that author the approbation of reading the ſcriptures in the vulgar tongue.

In this fashion he alſo couſeneth his reader in his citation of S. Hierome, affirming that in his epiſtle to Paulinus he ſayth that the booke of Geneſis is moſt plaine for euerie mans vnderſtanding; whereas S. Hierome rehearſing ſeuerallie all the parts of ſcripture with an intent to shewe breiflie what they containe, & what meanes is required to the true vnderſtanding of them, & particularlie ſignifying to Paulinus that he would haue him vnderſtand that he cannot vndertake the worke or interpriſe of reading ſcriptures without a maſter; putteth the booke of Geneſis firſte in order as it lyeth in the Bible, ſayeing thus, *videlicet manifeſta eſt Geneſis*, meaning not that the contents of the booke are manifeſt & eaſie to be vnderſtood as Sir Humfrey doth moſt falſelie affirme him to ſay, hut onelie affirming that in the whole number of the bookes of ſcripture the Geneſis is manifeſtlie knowne to be one & the firſte of the ſame number: for which reaſon he doth in like manner conſequentlie

adde

adde of the two bookes following, saying presentlie after, *patet Exodus, in promptu est Leuiticus &c.* By which particulars the true sense of S. Hierome doth so plainelie appeere to make nothing for our aduersaries purpose, that we may iustlie wonder how he could haue the face to peruert & detort it in so shameleſſe a fashion.

And by such trickes & fraudes as this, & now & then dropping a lye or two by the way, as that the Romish Preistes agree like Pilate & Herod both to the condemnation of Christe & his word: & that it is a crime worthie the Inquisition for the people to haue a Bible, & the like; still dissembling the true state of the question, which is not whether the laytie can lawfullie read the scriptures absolutelie, but whether they can read them commonlie & without licence, & that in vulgar tongues; it being euer supposed, that in Latine Greeke or Hebrew anie one that can, may reade them: by those fraudes I say & such like insincere dealing the knight patches vp this peece of his by way for his priuate spirit to walke in, where I leaue him to his melancholie contemplations & passe forward to the next matter.

The third section is about the interpretation of scripture, in which question Sir Humfrey affirmes that according to the iudgment of the ancient Fathers the Bible is the sole Iudge of Sect. 3.

con-

controuersies, & interpreter of it selfe. For this his affirmation he cites diuers places out of S. Augustine, Ambrose, & Chrysostome, but in this he sheweth verie small iudgment in the reading & vnderstanding of the ancient Doctors: For it is cleere to anie cleere wit that these holie Fathers onelie speake by way of instruction, & to such onelie as for their owne priuate profit, comfort, &, vnderstanding read & interpret scriptures as they read them to themselues, & not as publike Iudges or deciders of doubs in faith or manners: And in this sense onelie & not otherwise the foresaid Fathers proceede (excepting the place of S. Augustin cited out of his confessiõs which yet is to a differẽt purpose from this we here treate as in an other place I will declare) perhaps to the end they might more easlie persuade such as in their time were slowe & ought to haue binne more diligent by reason of their profession qualitie & capacitie, to retire & cohibit themselues from the accustomed vanities of those dayes, & applie themselues to that holie & wholesome exercise. And yet more then this except Sir Humfrey will adde to the Fathers sentences the worde sole, as his Father Luther did to the text of S. Paul: nay & the word *controuersie* also, he will neuer iustifie by their authoritie his vast proposition, viz: that scripture is the sole Iudge & interpreter of itselfe.

Quod si nõ poteris assiduitate lectionis inuenire quod dicitur accede ad sapientiorem, vade ad Doctorem. Chrysost. hom. 3. de Laz.

Optatus

Optatus ſpeake of one particular caſe for which the ſcriptures were plaine & cleere, not in generall, nor yet doth either he or Pope Clement ſpeake of ſole ſcriptures, but of ſcriptures interpreted according to the traditionarie & current ſenſe of the ſucceſſiue Catholike Church or cheefe paſtors for the time preſent, not of particular Doctors of priuate ſpirits, in which diſtinction conſiſteth the mayne difference betwixt the Romaniſts & the Reformers in this points, which if you Sir Humfrey had duelie pondered, & conſidered how much authoritie the ancient Fathers & particularlie ſainct Auguſtine commonlie attributes to the Church in expounding ſcripture & determining controuerſies, I perſuade my ſelfe you would neuer haue had the face eyther to denie that euer the ancient Fathers made anſere to the Heretikes of their tymes that they muſt heere the Church or that their Church was that Catholike Church which is the ſole iudge of Controuerſies, & the viue or liue interpreter of ſcriptures, & which they ought to heere in all doubtfull caſes & obſcure, or difficult queſtions: nor yet could you haue ſo inconſtantlie hallucinated as to affirme in one place that the text of ſcripture is the ſole Iudge & expounder of itſelfe indefinitlie & without limitation, & yet on the contrarie in another place that you doe not denie the authoritie of the Fathers iointlie agreing in the expoſition of

Euangelio non crederē niſi Eccleſia Catholica me commoueret authoritas. tom. 7. contr. ep. fund.

Quiſquis falli metuit huius obſcuritatē quæſtionis, Eccleſiam de illa conſulat &c. Lib. 1. cōt. Creſc. cap. 33.

them in matters of faith, & yet further that the same Fathers referred the meaning of the scriptures to the author of them; as if the holie Ghost were bound to appeere visiblie to deliuer the true sense of them as often as anie controuersie of faith occurreth: All which & the like disparates the vertiginous knight vttereth within the compasse of this one section, also further accusing the Romanists that they make themselues Iudges & plaintiffes in their owne cause, wheras indeed the Romanists neyther make themselues, but the euer visible continueing Church Iudge of their cause, nor doe they hould thẽselues for plaintiffes but for defendants & faithfull possessors of that doctrine which as it were by inheritance they receiued from their auncestors. And here I request the reader to reflect how disconformably the knight discourseth to his owne receiued Principle touching the interpretation, & sense of scriptures of which he & his brothers make euerie priuate person, man or woman, Iudge & vmpier, & yet condemnes for vnreasonable that the Roman Church should vse the like authoritie, euen when it is publikelie assembled in a generall Councell. So that these & all those a foresaid particulars deliuered by our aduersarie touching this point are but onelie his owne fancyes of which he makes vse for want of better materialls to patch vp this part

of

of his by path, in which as you see he continueth his peripateticall exercise euen to the next section.

In which, it being the fourth in Order he prosecuteth the same matter, telling his reader that the Romanists tho' they pretend otherwise, yet they make themselues sole Iudges & interpreters of scripture, thus the Knight fableth, of whom I tknowe I may iustlie say with the Poet *mutato nomine de te fabula narratur.* And in reallitie of whome I pray can this be so trulie verified as of those who notobstanding that vnder a false colour that euen in cases of doubt & controuersie they ingenuouslie professe that scriptures must be interpreted by themselues onelie, yet neuertheless doe most pertinaciouslie maintaine that the exposition of them belongs to euerie member of their Church in particular, & that the spirit of interpretation is as common to one as to another; for what is this but to make themselues sole Iudges & interpreters of the scripture, & not the scripture itselfe as they deceitfullie pretend? Let the indifferent reader be Iudge of this. Sec. 4. Vid. Chā. Panstrat. l. de inten. scrip.

It is true the Councell of Trent doth decree that none expound the scriptures contrarie to the vniforme consent of Fathers, yea & Pius Quintus doth also declare in his Bull of the profession of faith that such as are preferred to dignities & places of care of soules take an

oath of the ſame; but as they take the oath ſo doe they performe alſo the obligation of it. And I demand of Sir Humfrey who hath ſuch a great talent in reprehending, whether he thinkes not in his conſcience that thoſe who vnder the ſtrict bõd of oath are obliged to anie matter, are not more like to performe it then thoſe who haue no ſuch obligation whereby to reſtraine their actions? ſurelie there is a great difference in the circumſtances, & conſequentlie a great reaſon to iudge that thoſe Romaniſts who haue ſuch an oath obliging them to followe the conſent of Fathers in their interpretations of ſcripture, will be farre more carefull to performe the ſame then the reformed Doctours who haue no ſuch bridle to refraine the inclination to noueltie of their itching witts,

Now wheras Sir Humfrey after his ordinary cauilling manner doth ſay, that if the Romane Church can make good the vniforme conſent of Fathers for their twelue new arricles of faith he will liſten to their interpretation & preferre it before any priuate or later expoſition, this I ſay is a meere ſophiſme in regard that the Roman Church doth not teach as he ignorantly miſtakes, that he who interpreteth ſcriptures muſt haue poſitiuely the vniforme conſent of Fathers for his expoſitions, but onely that he muſt not wittingly expound any place of ſcripture

ture in matters of moment especially in faith & manners contrary to the whole torrent of the same Fathers; the which because the knight did not rightly vnderstand as it seemes when he read the Concell & the Bull of Pius, he abuseth Caietane, Canus, Andradius, Bellarmine, Baronius, & other moderne Romanists as if they had contradicted the foresaid decree, wheras yet one of them to wit Caietan writ before it was established, the rest being knowne for notorius defenders of it: & so running vpon false grownes, the wandering knight passeth forward citing among Romanists some of his consorts, & building his By-way (to omitt others of lesse moment, & diuerse scurrilous scoffes touching the application of scriptures by the Romanists notobstanding its well knowne he & his companions are much more guilty in that kinde) with two notorious vntruthes affirming that all the pristes & Iesuites are sworne not to receaue & interpret scriptures but according to the vniforme consent of Fathers, & that it is an article of the Roman faith so to doe: all which needes no further examen in regard that to any iuditious reader these two particulars onely will be sufficient to acquaint him which the rest of the authors iugling trickes which he vseth in this part of his by-way, which being voyde of substantiall matter itsuteth best to him that made it, but

agreeth nothing to the Catholike Romã faith.

Sect. 5. In the fifth ſection he handleth his Canon of ſcriptures, which he promiſeth to proue by pregnant teſtimonies of all ages, that it is the ſame which learned Doctors & profeſſors intirely preſerued in the beſome of the Roman Church in all ages.

I haue treated of this in parte in my former Cenſure, to which I adde returning that Sir Humfrey ſaith of Campion vppon himſelf, which is that if this Nouelliſt had binne as reall in his proofes as he is prodigall in his promiſſes, he had gome beyond all the reformed proſelites ſinces the daies of Luther, for neuer man made greater florishes with poorer proofes, all that he bringeth being founded vppon the ſame equiuocation which he vſed in his ſafe way conſiſting of this propoſition, the Fathers of euery age haue acknowledged the 22. bookes of ſcripture which the reformed Churches hold for Canonicall to be the true Canon & no other. For it is true the Fathers of all ages receiued from Chriſte & his Apoſtles thoſe ſame bookes, acknowledging them for Canonicall, but it is falſe, that the ſame fathers in all ages held no other for Canonicall, of which truth particular inſtance may be made in S. Augnſtine who (as Caluin confeſſeth being a faithfu l witneſſe of antiquity) teſtifieth touching the bookes of the Machabees, that

Lib. 18. de Ciuit. cap. 36.
Caluin. li. 4. Inſt. c. 14. fine.

that althou' the Iewes receiue them not for Canonicall, yet the Church doth receaue them.

And according to this it being true that few or none of the great multitude of writers which the kinght produceth in euery ſeuerall age doe poſitiuely affirme that thoſe 22. bookes of ſcripture onely which the reformers vſe were by the vniuerſall Chriſtian Catholike Church held to be the complete or intire Chriſtian Canon of the ould teſtament, or that thoſe particular bookes now in controuerſie betwixt vs & them were expreſly reiected euē by the Iewes themſelues, as not Canonicall, or not of infallible credit, & not rather held by them for ſacred & diuine althou not regiſtred in their Canon (which is the cheife part of Sir Humfreyes propoſition) it followeth cleerly that he quite faileth in his proofe, & that for all his braggs, he onely ſteppeth out of his pretended ſafe way into the ſame by path he hath euer walked in ſince he firſte began to write, neuer omitting his occuſtomed ſleightes in the allegation of authors & concluding his ſection with that laregely eſo often repeated by him in this & other places, as affirming that by his aduerſaries owne confeſſions the true & orthodox Church did reiect thoſe Apocriphall bookes which his Church reiecteth, & the Trent Councell alloweth at this day for Canonicall: out of which thraſo-

nicall audacity of this boysterous Catualier, the reader may easily take a scantling of the rest, & so come to know the fox by his tatterd tayle.

Sec. 6. In his sixt sex section he pretendeth to solue the Romanists arguments deduced frō authoritie of Fathers & Councells for those bookes which the reformers hold for Apocriphall. Touching which point, althou' it cannot be denyed but that doubt was made in former times among the fathers whether the foresayd bookes were Canonicall or not, in which there was diuersitie of opinions especially before the Councell of Carthage: neuertheless it is certaine that neither the whole Church in any Councell, nor yet anie of the Doctors or fathers did pōsitiuely at any time euer agree to exclude them out of the Christian Canon, but as some of the fathers made doubt of the same so others made none at all, among whome S. Augustine was so confident in that matter that in his 2. booke of Christian doctrine, & that not *obiter* but professedly treating of it; he setteth downe the very same number & names of the very same bookes which the Roman Church defendeth for Canonicall at this present day: & yet notobstanding this our aduersarie is so presumptuous & voyde of shame that he doubtes not to affirme that Sainct Page. 132. Augustine did not allow the bookes of Iudith, wisdome, Ecclesiasticus, & the Machabees,

for

for Conanicall. In iuſtification of which his impudent aſſertion it is wondrous to conſider how the crafty Sicophant doth exeercíſe his witts in framing euaſions wherby to elude the plaine teſtimony of that renowned orthodox Doctor, & the decree of the Counceil of Carthage in that particular, to which, the ſame S. Auguſtine ſubſcribed euẽ in this ſame point of the Canonicall ſcriptures reiected by the pretẽſiue reformed Churches. Howbeit all that Sir Humfrey could inuent for the infringeing of theſe two ſound & irrefragable authorities conſiſts either wholely or cheeflie in equiuocations & inſincere dealing in the citing & conſtrueing of the authors he alleageth, yea & in vttering of diuers plaine vntruthes, as where he ſaith of the third Councell of Carthage, that it is not of that authority as the Romaniſts themſelues pretend, adding preſently after for reaſõ of his firſt lye another as great or greater againſt Bellarmine, affirming that the Cardinall whẽ the Proteſtants produce this Councell againſt the head of their Church, anſweteth that this prouinciall Councell ought not to binde the Byſhops of Rome nor the Byſhops of other Prouinces, & citing him for this ſayeing in his 2. booke de Rom. Pont. cap. 31. where neuertheleſſe there are no ſuch wordes to be found, And finallie to omitt other of leſſe noyſe, he affirmes that S. Auguſtine de-

declares by pregnant & ſeuerall reaſons that the Machabees are Apocriphall, & yet he denyeth not euen in this very place but that the ſame S. Auguſtine both put them in the Canon of the ſcriptures in his ſecond booke de doct. Chriſt: nor yet that he affirmed in his 18. booke de Ciuit. Dei cap. 36. that the, Church hath them for Canonicall thou' the Iewes hould them not for ſuch.

By which it appeeres, that Sir Humfrey touching this point of controuerſie, is not in the way of S. Auguſtine & of the determination of the Church of Rome in his times, but is with ſhame enuffe fallen againe into his owne by way, where he & his progenitors haue euer wandred ſince the daies of Luther.

Sect. 7. In the ſeuenth ſection he reprehendeth the proofe of Catholike doctrine by traditions, & makes ſuch a trade of dealing vntruelie, that one would thinke ſure he liues by lyeing. And now I verilie perſuade my ſelfe it is moſt true which a certaine ingenious Proteſtant ſayd of the Puritans, that they will rather affoord ten lyes then one oath. In his verie firſte wordes he affirmes that to admit traditions & other conſtitutions of the Church is the firſte article of the Roman Creed to which all Bishops & Preiſts are ſworne, citing in the margen the Bull of Pius the fourth: this is his firſt lye in this ſection, but he will make ſure it ſhall not

be

be his last, for he incontinentlie addeth two or three more one in the neck of another affirming that those obseruations & constitutions of the Church which Pope Pius mentioneth, are declared by the Councell of Trent to be those traditions which the Church receiueth with equall reuerence & religious affection (for so the knight insincerelie translates the wordes *pari pietatis affectu*) as she receaues the holie scriptures: adding more that heere was the firste alteration made touching the rule of faith, with diuers other falsities too large to recount. And yet if when he read the foresayd Bull he had not for hast scipped ouer the whole Creed (which the Pope placeth in the verie firste part of the profession of faith) showeing euen by that vnfaithfull tricke how little faith he hath, I thinke he would neuer haue had the face to calumniate in this manner. And if to speake in commendation of diuine & Apostolicall traditions in that forme of speach which the Councell vseth, were to make alteration in the rule of faith as the knight will haue it, yet is it apparentlie false that the Tridentine Councell was the firste author of that alteration, for that (to omit other authorities of ancient Fathers of the same nature) sainct Chrysostome who liued in the beginning of the fouerth age of Christian religion vseth the same manner of

Ego firma fide credo omnia & singula quæ continẽtur in symbolo fidei &c. Bul: Pij 4. sup. form. iur. prof. fid.

phrase

Com. in c. 2. Epist. 2. ad Thes. phrase if not playner, sayeing that *it doth appeere that the Apostles did not deliuer all by epistles, but manie things without writing, but as well these as those deserue the same faith.* The which is not onelie as much as can be expressed for the authoritie of traditions, but also a more playne & commendable testimonie then anie Romanist euer vttered concerning the same. From whence the reader may deduce that the knight is heere also out of the right way of the primitiue Church, in which he runneth forward till the verie end of his section, & like a man ouer heated breatheth out nothing but abuses of diuerse moderne diuines which he citeth & in a cauilling & captious sort peruerts their true sense & meaning in all, or most places by him alleaged.

Sec. 8. In the eight section he pretends to proue that the traditions of the Roman Church were vnknowne to the Greeke Church & that they want vniuersalitie antiquitie & succession; but on the contrarie that faith which the reformed Churches maintaine at this day, is the same in substance which the Apostles published in Greece, & therefore hath antiquitie vniuersalitie & succession. And this is the substance of his section, if anie substance it hath.

But in truth he proueth his position with such *mediums*, that I am scarce willing to relate them for losse of time; the greatest part of his

his proofes being but eyther his owne bare & falſe affirmations, or onelie friuolous argumẽts long ſince anſered & deſtroyed by Bellarmin, and other Romaniſts, & partlie alſo by my ſelfe in my Cenſure; or elſe they are onelie authorities drawne from his owne brothers both in religion & lyeing, as from Illiricus whome Bellarmine doth cleerlie diſcouer to haue binne moſt expert in that black art, or from other profeſſed enimies of the Roman Church as Nylus & other Grecian Sciſmatikes: adding alſo the reſiſtance or diſclame of ſome Grecians in different occaſions, & heere & there *without doubt* of his owne citing diuers authors vnfaithfullie for his owne aduantage contrarie to their meaning, eſpeciallie Bellarmine whome he abuſeth in diuers places, partelie by peruerting his ſenſe & partlie by mangling his ſentences, as lib. 2. de verbo Dei cap. 16. lib. 2. de Monach. cap. 30. lib. 1. de Sanct. beatid. cap. 19. mingling alſo ſome vntruthes, as that moſt of the Greeke & Latin Fathers did hould that the faithfull till the reſurrection doe not attaine to the beatificall viſion of God &c. And now let the prudent reader iudge whether Sir Humfrey doth proceed ſollidlie, or rather not moſt abſurdlie & weaklie in that he goeth about to eleuate the antiquitie, vniuerſalitie, & ſucceſſion of the Roman faith eytherin generall or particular points by virtue

of

of a ſcattered companie of moderne Grecians who in thoſe matters they diſſent from vs contrarie to the doctrine of their moſt ancient & renowned auncestors, haue no more authoritie then the pretended reformers themſelues; nay & eſpeciallie conſidering them to be of a religion which agrees neyther intirelie with ours, & yet much leſſe with theirs, what a madneſſe is it in the knight to make vſe of their authoritie, eyther to infringe the antiquitie, vniuerſalitie, & ſucceſſion of the Roman doctrine, or for confirmation of his owne.

Dicunt (Armeni) in Chriſto Domino vnam naturam eſſe, vnam voluntatem vnamque operationē. Aub. Mir. not. Epiſc. P. 43.

Hodie (Æthiopes) & baptiſantur & circumciduntur. Idem p. 54.

Neyther is Sir Humfrey (thou' moſt repugnant to the knowne truth) content to ſay that the Greeke Church hath continued the truth of his doctrine in all ages, but he alſo addeth further that if we looke beyond Luther, we ſhall eaſilie diſcerne that the Muſcouites, Armenians, Egiptians, & Ethiopians, did teach their reformed doctrine, euen from the Apoſtles time till now. By which particulars I doubt not but the reader may perceaue euen without a comentarie, how ridiculous he makes himſelfe & his Religion & to what ſtreits this mā was put, & how impoſſible it is for him to auoyde the by way in the proofe of his antiquitie, vniuerſalitie, & ſucceſſion, who by his owne confeſſion was forced to fetch his faith from ſuch by places & deuious regions where yet he hath not found it, but remaineth ſtill

in his owne vnquoth English by way.

The nynth section pretendeth to proue that the scriptures are a certayne safe & euident way to saluation, & traditions a by way. In which section Sir Humfrey beginneth with a large homelie about the certaintie & safetie of scriptures, which two wordes because he peraduenture dreamed the night before he writ this, that he had seene them in the scripture, the one in the first of S. Luke 4. the other Philip. 3. 1. he assured himselfe he had thrust the Papists frō the wall at the first push. But alas for pittie, his dreame proued so false that when he awaked he found himselfe in the channell; for in neyther of those places are those wordes found, nay nor yet the sense which he intendeth heere, which being no other then that onelie scriptures & no tradition is to be followed in anie matter of faith or manners, neyther those two places of scripture nor anie other testimonie that he bringeth eyther out of anie scripture or Fathers doth proue his peremptorie position, but onelie shewe that all scriptures are profitable to instruct a man in all good workes to the end he may be perfect, & moreouer that the scriptures be as Bellarmine sayth a most certaine & most safe rule of faith; yet that they be the sole or onelie certaine & safe rule, neyther Bellarmine nor anie other Romanist, nor yet anie proofe

or

or testimonie which the knight produceth doth eyther teach or testifie. It is true Sir Humfrey alleageth diuers authors, but all according to his accustomed manner, that is neyther much to the purpose nor yet verie faithfullie, & the testimonies of those eyther impertinētlie produced, or alreadie cleared by Bellarmine & other Controuertists, to containe nothing contrarie to the Roman doctrine in this particular: or else such obscure grolles as neyther his predecessors, as I thinke, did euer cite by reason of their smale authoritie, nor are they of that moment that they deserue anie answere at all: as Waltram & Fauorinus which at the leaste by reason of the ill vse he maketh of thē serue the knight for nothing more then to leade him out of the common path of the euerduring & constant Church (as a sure guide which according to the scriptures cannot faile euen by the power of hell) into a dangerous diuerticle of scriptures expounded by deductions proceeding from the priuate spirit of particular men, which is all he concludes in this his section.

Sec. 10. From hence Sir Humfrey passeth to another matter, that is to the testimonies of the ancient fathers, where he chargeth the Romanists that they eyther openly reiect them, or secretly decline their authority by euasions in particular pointes. This is the tenth section a great

a great part of which is repeated out of his firſte booke & anſered by me in my cenſure. He makes a large preamble touching the clayme the Romaniſts make to the ancient fathers as patrons of their doctrine, & as if they did arrogate that which is not their owne: but the diſcourſe is very idle & *mutatis mutandis*, may be verie iuſtely verified of the knight & his predeceſſors, eſpeciallie Iewell & Pleſſis who both of them were the greateſt braggars in that kind that euer were, & yet none ſo shameleſſe in corrupting the Fathers workes & abuſing their ſenſe, as themſelues. The reſt of this ſection is verie meane ſtuffe conſiſting of captious conſtructions of the ſayeings of ſome Romaniſts, & contorting them to this matter as if they did diſeſteeme or reiect the ancient Fathers authoritie which is impoſſible to be true, as is manifeſtlie conuinced by the continuall vſe they make of them much more then the Nouelliſts, as it is well knowne to the world: And the truth is that the Romaniſts onelie modeſtlie confeſſe eſpeciallie when they are vrged to it by the clamours of the ſectaries, that ſome of the Fathers in their ſingle opinions, or in ſuch caſes as they did not all conſent together, did ſometimes perhapps fall into ſome erroneous point of doctrine, & that they are not alwayes & in euerie point to be followed in their expoſitions of ſcriptures or o-

therwiſe in matters nothing concerning the controuerſies of theſe tymes: But onelie when they all agree in matters of faith, or by graunting that in pointes of practiſe (for example about the Communion in one kinde or priuate Maſſe) they are not all & in all matters expreſlie for them: How beit they knowe they neither are againſt them all things conſidered. Which if it be duelie pondered is no inconuenience at all, in regard that theſe things & ſuch others be mutable according to the diuerſitie of times & perſons, & conſequentlie might be otherwiſe thē by practiſed thē by vs. Neyther doe the Romaniſts when they affirme the Fathers to be for them teach (as the knight doth falſelie & deceitfullie ſuppoſe) that all the Fathers in euerie point of faith beit tranſubſtantiation or anie other, are poſitiuelie for them; but onelie that the whole ſtreame nay nor anie part of them is poſitiuelie againſt them in anie ſuch doctrine, & that in the moſt pointes they are expreſſelie & wholie for them, & againſt the reformers in all.

Pag. 290. Out of which the reader may collect how impudently the kinght doth belye the foreſaid Romaniſts, when he affirmeth that, *they are reputed no good Catholikes by their owne tenets that teach not contrary to the vniforme conſent of Fathers*, eſpeciallie conſidering that he himſelfe hath already related how the ſame Romaniſts take

take an expresse oath to follow that consent. And by this it may in like fashion be easilye perceaued, how little credit this man deserues when he accuseth his aduersaries of citation of counterfeit authors, wheras he himselfe doth deale so vniustly in that nature, especially with Bellarmine, that he doth not onely mutilate his wordes, but also citeth that which is not to be found, as by way of example you may see page 290. where he affirmes Bellarmine to professe that they are not to be numbred among Catholiques that thinke the Virgin Mary was conceiued in originall sinne; for hauing deligently passed ouer two seuerall times the 15. chap. of the 4. booke de amiss. grat. which is that same Sir Humfrey citeth, I find no such sentence nor words in it, but rather the quite contrary doctrine, as by his owne words in my margen related clerely appeares: neither is it lesse plainly false which he affirmeth for the conclusion of this section, to wit that Bellarmine & the Romanists in generall some times condemne the Fathers as counterfeit some times they purge them as if they were full of corruptions, & that according to seuerall occasions they haue their seuerall deuices to produce them or auoyd them at their pleasure, yea & that they confessing the to be counterfeit, yet produce them for their doctrine. all which particulars are so farre from truth, that

Sect. 4. init.

Neque desunt qui impudenter affirment ab Ecclesia Romana defendi conceptionem immaculatam Virginis Mariæ tanquam articulum fidei. Bell. loco cit.

they cry shame on the author, & so much the more in regard that he & his brothers are not a little guiltie in this busines, but doe daily offend in the same kinde as by many instances might be proued & particularly in that one for example of the *Imperfect*, which passing vnder the name of S. Chrisostome is conuinced by Bellarmine & others not to be his, in regard it houldeth the Homousians for heretikes, & yet is it commonly cited by our aduersaries & euen by Sir Humfrey himself in diuers places of his workes, in which they verifie most fitly that of the Apostle, in that while they preach to others that they must not steale, they steale themselues.

Rom. 2. 21.

Neyther yet doe any of the testimonyes which the kinght produceth for his accusation of Bellarmine in this nature proue his intent, nor any thing more then that both Bellarmine & other Romanists doe indeed some times produce such authors in fauour of their doctrine as are not by all Romanists held to be of certaine & vndoubted authority, or at the least not certainly iudged to be the workes of those authors whose names they beare; thou' otherwise all those who cite them hold them for workes of ancient standing & not counterfeit, at least in the substance of their authority, as the knight doth counterfeitly indeuore to perswade his reader: nay Bellarmine whome

the knight particularly taxeth in this behalf showeth himself so iust & sincere in this point that he is not content eyther alwayes, or for the most parte to aduertise the reader when he cites doubtfull authors in his tomes of controuersies; but also to take away all occasion of cruple in himself, & of calumniation in others, he hath made a particular censure of such authors as are in anie sort held for doubtfull or Apochriphal, or otherwise called in question. And so to conclude this, the reader may see by what indirect courses Sir Humfrey huddles vp this parte of his by-way for himself & freinds to spend their tyme in.

In his eleauenth section he indeuoureth to proue that the substantiall pointes of the Romane faith as they are now receiued & taught by the Church of Rome were neuer taught by the primitiue Church nor receiued by the ancient Fathers; these are the contents of the section, but it containes so little substance that we may trulie say it stands onelie for a Cipher to increase the number. He begins with a great commendation of the scriptures, because he would seeme to say something plausible to the common people, but I knowe none make lesse estimation of thē in reallitie then he & his consorts who tye them like a nose to the grindestone, to the interpretation of those priuate spirits who haue walked within the com- Sec. 11.

passe of a hundred yeeres or little more, rather then to the consent of all succeeding ages since they firste were penned. And I pray you what is this preamble to the purpose of prouing the Roman faith not to haue binne taught by the ancient Fathers or the primitiue Church? the knight produceth certaine places out of sainct Augustine, & Ambrose, to proue that they preferred scriptures before the writings of the Fathers, & that they appealed from them to scriptures: but what Romanist in the world denyeth that the scriptures haue incomparable preheminence aboue all other writings whatsoeuer? or what Roman Catholike doth not willinglie graunt that when the scriptures are plaine & the doctrine of the Fathers obscure or doubtfull, prouocation from them to the scriptures is rightlie made: But that euen in such cases as the Fathers doe vniformlie agree in matter of faith or generallie receaued practise of the Church, it is vsuall & lawfull to appeale from them to scriptures, especiallie when they are not plaine & manifest; this I say neyther those holie Fathers produced by the knight did euer teach, neyther can anie reason be found to proue it, but rather it is cleerlie against all reason, as opening the by-way to all sortes of heresie.

And if Sir Humfrey when he read S. Augustine *contra Cresconi*: had but passed one other

step

ſtep forward, he might haue found that famous Father not to appeale to ſcripture onelie, but alſo to the authoritie of the Church, ſince that preſentlie after he had ſayd that he held not ſainct Cyprians epiſtle for Canonicall, but examined it by Canonicall ſcripture (which are the words our aduerſarie cites) he addes & that with a great emphaſis ſayeing. *Non accipio inquam, I ſayd I doe not receaue that which S. Cyprian holdeth of rebaptization, becauſe the Church doth not receaue it for which bleſſed ſainct Cyprian shed his blond*: By which the reador may plainelie perceiue that one & as it were the cheife motiue which ſainct Auguſtine had to reiect the doctrine of rebaptization, was not the ſole authoritie of the ſcripture, as not being in that caſe ſo cleere as to conuince S. Cyprian, but be ſtruck the laſt ſtroake by force of the authoritie of the Catholike Church. And thus you ſee Sir Humfrey is ſtill out of the way of the Fathers which he himſelfe citeth, if they be ritelie vnderſtood; & followeth his owne crooked tract, relating the particular pointes of the Roman doctrine vnfaithfullie as he vſeth to doe & making manie conditionall promiſes to ſubſcribe in caſe the ancient Fathers be found for vs, but remitting the performance to his next opportunitie, which is ſo farre to ſeeke that I aſſure my ſelfe he will neuer finde it.

Sec. 12. In his twelfth section he comes to particu-
Page 317. lars contending that S. Augustine is reiected by the Romanists in the seuerall pointes in which he agreeth, as he supposeth, with the Reformers. I expected Sir Humfrey would haue performed the large promise which he made in his precedent section, sayeing he dares confidentlie auowe that in all fundamentall pointes of difference the Romanists eyther want antiquitie to supplie their first ages, or vniuersalitie to make good the consent of Christian Churches, or vnitie of opinions to proue their Trent articles of beleife: but in steed of prouing this he goeth about the bush & euading the difficultie which he found impossible for himselfe to ouercome, he onelie indeuoures to persuade his reader that according to the Romanists owne confessions, saint Augustine is wholelie for the presumed reformers doctrine; for proofe of which he produceth diuers instances out of Roman diuines, but effecteth nothing, in regard that althou' it is true that some of the Romanists confesse that S. Augustine did dissent from their opinions, partlie in the interpretation of some certaine passages of scripture, & partlie in some other particulars, yet none of them confesse that in anie mayne point of religion or faith euen those which haue binne declared by the late Councell of Trent, that holie Doctor dissenteth

senteth from them, & in this consists the equi
vocation, which togeather with some vn-
truthes, which he vttereth, as when he affir-
mes that those which he rehearses heere, be
theise points in question betwixt vs, & such
like, is the by-way in which his worship wal-
keth with great grauitie all the lenght of this
section.

In his next ensueing section which is the 13. in number, he pretends that S. Gregorie who sent S. Augustiue the monke into England to preach the Christian faith is directlie oppositeto the Roman religion in the mayne pointes of faith. Sec. 13.

By the contents of this section it appeeres that the knight is as fitte to write matters of diuini-
tie as an asse is fitte to play on the fiddle, & he makes such fiddling worke as one may plainlie perceiue that eyther he doth not vnderstand the Fathers, & other Catholike authors that write in Latin, or that passion & malice quite obfuscate his witts when he reades them. In his 350. page he affirmes that in the vndoub-
ted writings of Gregorie there will be found few or no substantiall pointes which are not agreable to the tenets of their Church, & al-
together different from the Roman, this he sayth but in stead of proofe comming to par-
ticulars he committs diuers palpable fraudes: for firste whereas he professeth to compare

the

the doctrine of Tridentine Councell & his owne with the doctrine of sainct Gregorie in lieu of that he cites the doctrine of Bellarmine, the notes vpon the Rhemes testament, & the expurgatorie Index, which altho' they be authenticall Catholike authors, yet are they not rules of the Roman faith. Neither yet doth our aduersarie conuince them to be repugnant to sainct Gregories true meaning in anie one point of faith. And I earnestlie wish I had time & place to discouer to the reader the egregious fraude the knight hath vsed in his trãslation & interpretation of this holie Fathers wordes touching the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist: for by this onelie passage, he might frame a coniecture of the rest.

Greg. in 6. pſ. pœnit.

Secondlie wheras our aduersarie treateth in this section of substantiall pointes of faith, yet some of the particulars in which he exemplifies, are not substantiall points of faith, but rather of manners which according to diuersitie of times may alter & change, as priuate Masse, the double Communion, reading of scriptures in vulgar language, in which there is a mayne difference from matters of faith, which can neuer varie.

Thirdlie of all the pointes which he rehearseth being all as I take it 9. in number. There is but onelie one in which it can be sayd with anie coulourable probabilitie that sainct Gregorie

gorie in anie of the places heere cited doth contradict the doctrine of the Roman Church, & that is the point of the Canon of the ſcriptures, in which particular althou' he refuſed to giue the bookes of Machabees the title of Canonicall ſcripture, (as yet S. Auguſtine & others did before him, & the reſt of the writers, for the moſt parte, euer ſince haue donne (whether it were becauſe he ment onelie they were not contained in the Canon of the Iewes, or for that the whole Church had not then declared them for Canonicall vnder that name) Neuertheleſſe he is not to be iudged more repugnant to the doctrine of the preſent Roman Church in that point, then thoſe who notobſtanding that in the primitiue Church certaine bookes of the new Teſtament, as the epiſtle to the Hebrewes & others, were doubted of, yet now with infallible certaintie & faith receaue them for diuine, & ſacred ſcripture, althou' they were not accounted & beleiued for ſuch by all the orthodoxall Fathers of the Church in all former ages ſince the time of the Apoſtles who firſte published them to the world. Eſpeciallie conſidering that the ſame ſainct Gregorie neuer denyed neyther in the place cited nor in anie other of his workes, but that as the declaration of the Church was ſufficient to aſſure all faithfull people that thoſe bookes of which before his dayes there had

binne

binne doubt, were then trulie Canonicall ſcripture thou' not knowne for ſuch in euerie age before him: ſo might the ſame ſucceeding Church in later times determine the like of thoſe bookes which in his time ſo generallie & vndoubtedlie were not as yet held for ſuch. Neyther according to the rules of diuinitie can that man be reputed not to be of the ſame religion of which another is, becauſe he now beleaueth ſome thing more in the materiall obiect of faith then the other did in that time in which he liued; but at the moſt it can onelie be truelie verified that he hath the ſame habit of faith thou' ſome what more extended in the obiect, as neyther the Apoſtles were of a diuerſe faith when they were firſte inſtructed by Chriſte before his paſſion from that they had after his reſurrection, when yet doubtleſſe they receaued more expreſſe, & extenſiue knowledge in matters of faith then before they had receiued. And ſure I am S. Gregorie without exception cites both the booke of Tobie, & Eccleſiaſticus: & ſapience moſt frequentlie: none of which bookes neuertheleſſe the miſreformers admit for the worde of God. And till Sir Humfrey or ſome of his aſſociates can produce out of S. Auguſtin & S. Gregorie as plaine & pregnant places either for his owne tenets, or againſt the Roman doctrine as the Romaniſts haue long ſince produced for theirs

as

as their workes vpon euerie ſeuerall contro-uerſie make apparent, let them for shame neuer claime them for theirs in anie one point of controuerſie: for notobſtanding they make a plauſible vſe of ſome fewe patches of their more ambiguous, ill conſtrued, & ill related ſentences, yet turne but the iudicious & vnpartiall reader to the bookes them ſelues, & he will ingenuouſlie confeſſe & abſolutelie crye a loud, all is ours.

And if it would pleaſe his maieſtie of his royall clemencie to ſuffer vs freelie to make tryall of our cauſe by ſcripture, & Fathers, I knowe which ſide would be founde *minus habens*, manie graines to light. But it is our great miſerie (yet in one ſenſe our great happines) to be ſo croſſed & curbed with ſeueritie of tẽporal lawes that we cannot be ſafe in the moſt priuate corners, much leſſe can we appeare in any publike aſſemblie for defenſe of our Religion.

But yet ſuppoſing that S. Gregorie had binne contrarie in that particular of the bookes of Machabies (for touching the reſt mentioned by the Knight he is ſufficientlie cleered from that imputation by Bellarmine & other Romaniſts) yet could it not poſſiblie proue that monſtrous great propoſition of our aduerſarie, to wit that S. Gregorie in his vndoubted writings directlie oppoſeth the Romish faith in the maine pointes thereof; & conſequentlie from

Vid. Bell. in quæ-tuor Cõtr. tom. vlt. & Analeſ. fid.

from hence it manifestlie appeereth how farre Sir Humfrey hath walked by the way, when in the end of his eleauenth section he auouched his reader should plainlie discerne how the later Popes & Bishops doe differ from the former, & how these two Fathers of the Church (meaning sainct Augustine & sainct Gregorie) concurre expresselie with the doctrine professed in the reformed Churches different from the Roman; it being most apparent by the premisses, that by anie thing which he hath heere produced out of the forefayd Fathers, he hath neyther proued anie one point of his owne religiõ, nor disproued ours; but hath onelie prestigiouslie deluded the eyes of the reader with a coulorable florish, & yet in realitie remaineth still in the same byway in which he hath hitherto walked separate from the royall street of the ancient Doctors of the primitiue Church.

Sect. 14. The next section being the fourteenth is that the ingenuous Romanists confesse that the Councells which they oppose against the Reformers, were neyther called by lawfull authoritie, nor to the right ends.

Heere I finde that to be most true which a pleasant Protestant pronounceth of the Puritans sayeing, their religion willinglie admitts no founder, but Bragger & they flourished much about a time. And in sober sadnes the best Sir Humfrey can make of his aduer-

saries confession throu' out his whole worke in fauour of his doctrine, doth nothing more then plainlie conuince him to be of no other progenie: Neyther doe their confessions fit his purpose anie better then if he should put his shooes vpon his handes, or his hose vpon his head.

A patterne of this you may see in this vetie section, in which howsoeuer he vaunteth of the confession of his aduersaries, & that by two principall conditions (as he sayth) ancientlie in vse for the authoritie of Councells are both acknowledged to be abrogated by later Councells, to wit because, quoth the knight, now a dayes the Pope calls Councells without right, & he & his assemble them in their owne name & for their owne ends: for proofe of which calumnious position he cites but onely two authors & those scarce held for sound mettle among the Romanists: neyther yet doth eyther of them plainlie auerre his position as it is vttered by him; but they onelie speake by way of reprehension of such abuses as might be practised in that nature by the malice of men without taxing the Pope or anie other in particular, as the knight would maliciouslie inferre out of their wordes for the confirmation of the sinister opinion he hath of the Church of Rome & her head in earth. The rest which he hath in this section is but

either

eyther his owne bare assertions & those not true, as that from Moyses to the Machabies all temporall Princes practised power of calling assemblies, & that assoone as Kings receiued the Christian faith they executed the same power, & that the later Councells celebrated in the Roman Church are not assembled in the name of Christe: all the rest I say is eyther such stuffe as this, or else malitious corruptions of some Roman diuines as appeeres in Bellarmin & Valentia, the sense of both which authors he deceitfullie peruerteth, the one lib. 1. de Concil. cap. 10. the other tom. 3. d. 1. q. 1. p. 5. by which false & indirect dealing he doth nothing in this whole section but shewe himselfe to proceed in that by-way which his progenitors Luther & Caluin haue shewed him in their corrupted writings.

Sec. 15. In the 15. section Sir Humfrey affirmeth that Councells giue no support to the Romish religion: In his former section he professed great reuerence & respect towards the authoritie of Councells especiallie the fower firste, yet heere he spareth not the verie firste Generall Councell of those same fower which he so highlie commended before, but at once he striketh at no lesse then 60. of the 80. Canons it is commonlie held to containe, like a squinteyed waterman looking one way & roweing another, iust, as he did before in his feigned com-

commendation of traditions & Fathers. But let the reader marke what this man is to proue & how prepoſterouſlie he proueth it, & he will preſentlie iudge him not to be ſquinteyed onelie, but eyther ſtarke blind or ſtarke mad.

Heis to proue as he ſayth firſte that manie generall & particular Councells haue erred in euerie age which yet are produced for the Roman religion, but how doth he proue this I praye? marie becauſe the Councell of Cayphas ſayth he, is confeſſed by Bellarmine to haue perniciouſlie erred when it adiudged Chriſte a blaſphemer, therefore by Bellarmines confeſſion Councells produced for the Roman religion may erre. *Obſtupeſcite cæli!* O yee heauens ſtand yee aſtonished to heere this mans logike! & this being his firſte card iudge what the reſt of his hand may be, & how like he is to conclude, who argueth from Cayphas to Chriſte, from the old lawe to the new, from a Councell of falſe Iewes to Councells of true Chriſtiãs: the reader may ſee Bellarmins anſer to this parologiſme, if anie further anſer it deſerues in his opiniõ, for in my iudgemẽt it needes no more but a loud laſter, & thus I leaue it. *Vid. Bell. de Conc. l. 2. cap. 8.*

He paſſeth to the ſecond age & ſayth that the Councell of Antioch is cited by Gretzerus, by Turrian, by Baronius for the worship of images, & yet that the firſte publishers of the

Councells neuer mentioned it. But what is this to the purpose of prouing that by the confessions of Romanists manie decrees & Canons of Councells by them produced for the Roman religion are counterfeit or deuised to proue the Trent doctrine? doth it follow that because some publishers of Councells did not find this Councell or other such like in their dayes, therefore they did confesse them for spurious or Apochriphall or that those who afterwards haue brought them to light as the authors aboue named Baronius Turrian & Binnius haue not as much authoritie to publish them for authenticall as you & your criticall Cooke to denie them or condemne them for counterfeit; especiallie considering that those who allow this particular Councell of which we now speake, are all knowne to be of farre greater knowledge in matters of antiquitie then those that collected Councells before them, to witt Merlin & Crabbe Surius & Nicolinus, who althou' they be one more in number then those moderne Romanists who allowe this first Councell of Antioch as found in the librarie of ancient Origen, yet neyther doth the greater number contradict the lesse, nor yet if they did haue they so much authoritie as to preuaile before them.

Censura Patr.

In the third age the knight setts the Carthaginian Councell celebrated by S. Cyprian

& his Collegues, which Councell, ſayth the knight, may ſerue to proue that ſome Councells rightly called are diſchareged by our aduerſaries, adding that this Councell is therfore reiected by the Romaniſts by reaſon that S. Cyprian & the whole Councell appoſed the title of the Popes ſupremacie.

But in this proofe Sir Humfrey committeth diuers groſſe faultes, firſte in that he ſuppoſeth falſely that a Councell orderly conuocated ought not to be reiected, which is a poſition that I am ſure no Romaniſt, & as I thinke, no ſectary before Sir Humfrey euer defended: & the reaſon is for that it is not the aſſemblie, but the proceeding & concluding of a Councell is that which giues it deciſiue authority, otherwiſe a Councell without definitions ſubſcriptions & confirmation ſhould neceſſarily be receaued, which is moſt abſurd.

Secondly the kinght telleth his reader a manifeſt vntruth, where he affirmeth that the foreſayd Councell is therfore diſchareged becauſe S. Cyprian & the whole Councell appoſed the title of the Popes ſupremacie; for that Councell was aſſembled onely about rebaptization of thoſe which had binne baptiſed by heretiques, neyther is there any mention of the Popes authority eyther good or bad: but onely S. Cyprian by way of preface or preuention warneth thoſe Biſhops that were pre-

sent that euery one deliuer his sentence or verdict freely without iudging one another, because saith he, none of vs doth constitute himself Bishop of Bishopps, & so what is this I pray to the Bishop of Rome or Popes supremacy whome S. Cyprian so much respected that euen in this occasion as S. Hierome testifieth, he directed his sinod to Pope Stephan, which is an euident signe that he was not contrarie to the Popes supreme authority, but rather did disetely in that his fact acknowledge the same. Thirdly Sir Humfrey dealeth falsely when for conclusion of this point he saith that this may serue for proofe, that Councells rightly called are descharged by his aduersaries, when they make against the Trent faith, it being manifest that this Synod containes not any one of those matters which he contemptuously termeth the Tridentine faith. From whence it appeeres that in steed of proofes the liberall kinght hath giuen vs his owne impostures: And thus it fareth with him throu' all this section captiously concluding vniuersall propositions of particulars, as that some Romanists doe cite for the Popes supremacy one or two Councells of whose authority others make doubt, therfore the doctrine of the Popes supremacy is wholely grounded vpon vncertaine Councells: notobstanding he himself acknowledgeth that besides these few

Dialog. aduers. Lucif.

doubt

doubt full authorities, there be many more in number cited by Bellarmine & others that are vndoubted: & with ſuch ſophiſticall illations mingling diuers equiuocations & falſe ſuppoſitions, confounding generall Councells with particular & confounding truth with falſity, yea & much falſity without any mixture of truth, he concludeth his ſection in ſuch a fashion as it is eaſie for anie that hath his witts about him to perceaue he intendeth nothing elſe but to leade his reader into that ſame by-way which he ſtill laboureth to finish for himſelf & others of his owne profeſſion.

In his ſixteenth ſection the knight makes hoat warre againſt the Councell of Trent; & after he had in a couning & ſecret manner ſpit his poyſon at diuers other Councells of more ancient ſtanding in the precedent ſection, he ſingles this out alone as his moſt profeſſed enimy, & moſt ſeuere cenſurer of his faultes & crimes, vſing all his whole forces & art to diminish his ſtrength & power, & that not in hugger mugger but in plaine & manifeſt termes: affirming the ſame to be of ſmale or no credit as being neyther lawfully called nor free, nor eyther generall or generally receiued. He ſayth it was not lawfully called becauſe it was aſſembled by the Popes vſurped authority & not by the Emperour: but this being the firſte part of he proofe, it is both falſe in it ſelfe Sec. 16.

Serenissimo etiam Imperatori gratias agere, & gratulari iure optimo debemus.

——— *ille de nostris his rebus pro sua eximia pietate sollicitus mirifice fuit* Orat. hab. sess. 9.

self & also left vnproued otherwise then by his naked affirmation, & so it needes no other confutation then denyall; how beit so certaine & manifest it is that the Emperour consented vn to that Councell & approued both the conuocation & proceedings of it (as much as lay in his power) that I am persuaded the sectaries them selues with all their audaciousnesse haue not the face to deny so playne a truth, & so plainely expressed in the oration had in the last session of the sacred synod, in which great thankes ar rendered vnto him for his zeale & care therin imployed.

The second part of the proofe consists of a false suppositiō that no Councell can be legitimate except it be conuocated by the Emperour: but that this is false it is clearer then the day, otherwise it would follow that those Councells which were celebrated before there were any Christian Emperour in the world should haue binne vnlaufully called, as euen that of the Apostles themselues: & more if that position of the nouellists were true, what truth or authority can the Councells of the pretensiue reformed Churches haue, none of which as yet had euer any Emperour of their religion (& as I hope in God neuer will haue) at least since the daies of Luther euen by their owne confessions: which pouerty of their poore ragged flock it seemes Sir Humfrey had quite

Act. 15.

for-

forgotte when he vttered that falſe maxime of the reformed doctrine. Secondly he ſayth, the Councell of Trent was not free; & yet he confeſſeth in this ſame place that he denieth not but that ſafe conduct was promiſed as well to the Lutherans as to the Romaniſts, & yet as it ſeemes like cowardelie daſtardes they feared danger, *timuerunt vbi non erat timor*. And if they feared where there was no feare in whome I praye was the fault? now for freedome of ſpeech in propoſing of matters & diſcuſſing them Sir Humfrey cannot deny if he will ſtand to the teſtimony of his owne Dudithius cited by himſelf who plainly ſuppoſeth freedome in that nature, in that he affirmes being a Proteſtant that the feild had binne theirs if they had not binne ouercome by number.

Hi (nuncij) Aquilonis partes prope omnes peragrarunt, rogarunt, obſecrarũt, obteſtati ſunt, tuta omnia, atque amica promiſerũt. &c. Ol. 45. vt ſupra.

Thirdly he affirmes that it was not generall, but how could it be more generall then by a generall & amicable conuocation of all Princes Prelates & learned diuines, which the Bull of indiction declares. And as for the number of thoſe who came vnto it thou' the knight do.h vſe all his art for the diminution of it, yet was it farre greater then he vouchſafed to recount, as the Catalogue prefixed to the Councell doth plainly declare, amounting to the number of 255. of thoſe who ſubſcribed to the decrees; & the truth is, if more had come more had binne admitted, & none reiected, which

Acclam. Patr in fine Conc.

euen of it self alone excepting others is a sufficient note of Generallity.

Fourthly, he saith it was not generally receiued, but in this he vseth one of his vsuall equiuocations, for althou' in some places as yet it is not receaued in matters of reformation & practise as in those places especially in which it hath neuer binne proclamed. Neuertheless in matters of faith it is generally receaued of all Roman Catholikes wher soeuer they bee, farre or neere, in Europe Asia, or America, or other forreigne Countries conuerted to the christian Catholike faith, & so the reader may see that this saieng of our aduersaries which they perpetually buzze into the eares of the simple people that the Councell of Trent is not generally receaued by the Romanists themselues, is meere cousenage & imposture malitiously inuented to auert their mindes from the most wholesome doctrine & profitable precepts of the same for the generall reformation of the Church, which because the false reformers plainly see it trenches to neere vppon their Copyhold, they ioyne heauen & hell together to infringe its authority. And here I aduertise the reader that our aduersarie vseth the relations of Some histories touching the proceeding of the Tridentine Councel which ar not admitted by the Romanists, & particularly those passages of Thuanus, of whome I haue receiued credible information that

dying a Roman Catholike he made a general retractation of all such positions or relations as he had publishedlesse aduisedly, or any way dissonant to the doctrine, or practise of the Roman Church: & so all such passages as Sir Humfrey produces out of his workes, ar esteemed as voyde of force for confirmation of anie parte of his doctrine.

The rest which Sir Humfrey vttereth in this section is nothing but certaine hereditarie vntruthes & impostures which he receaued from Caluin, Illiricus, & Sleidan & the counterfeit historie of the Councell of Trent published in the English tongue in disgrace of that most renowned Synod, whose authoritie will they nill they, they must suffer vs to honore, imbrace & obey at the least till such time as they can showe vs one of their owne of the like generallitie, grauitie, & authenticall & exacte proceeding which it hath vsed in discussion & determination of the most receaued doctrine of former & present ages, which if they cānot performe, then let thē confesse they haue left the cōmon & royall way of the anciēt Church, & fallen into a by-way of parlamentall, or pure consistoriall gouernment in matters of faith, not heard of in primitiue ages: as neyther, was their extranagant forme of Conuenticles, trulie generall, national, or prouinciall, as appeeres in their Pseudosinods of Gappe,

Tertium nonnullo, atque etiā quartum discussa: summa sæpe contentione certatum &c. Orat. hab. ad finem Concil.

Vide relat. Synod. Dordrecht

Gappe, & Dort, in which the reformed Prelates carryed themselues so zealouslie, that as it is crediblie reported they spent 2000. pounds in Renish wine to heat their spirits before euer they had decreed anie one point of their controuersies.

In his seauenteenth section Sir Humfrey doth nothing but foyst, babble, & abuse Bellarmine & other Romanists about the Church as if they extolled her aboue the scriptures & accusing here to haue spoyled herself of them, & as if it were vncertaine among them whether the Roman Church is the true Church because they teach it hath diuers acceptions, which is all false & friuolous matter; for that altho' the Church according to the heterogeniall partes & diuers functions of the persons of which it consists, may admit seuerall denominations, as are the essentiall, representatiue, or virtuall Church; in which point also peraduenture there may be found some difference among the Romanists in their manner of speech & speculations: yet in substance they all agree that the visible Church to which the faithfull must seeke in their doubtes is the visiblie & perpetuallie succeeding Church from th time of Christe till this day, which is the plaine way in which *etiam stulti ambulant*, euen the most simple sort of people may easilie finde & walke in; all other Churches especiallie the

Sec. 17.

inui-

inuisible Congregation of Sir Humfrey & his fellowes is but a blinde diuerticle & by-way, fitter for wanderers & vagabonds then for the true & honest people of God to walke in.

In the title of the 18. section, the knight pretendeth to proue that the Plea which the Romanists drawe from the infallible authoritie & title of the Catholike Church is false vaine & friuolous. Sec. 18.

Althou' the name & authoritie of the Catholike Church hath euer binne so odious to all sortes of sectaries, that they made it a cheife parte of their labours to impugne the same, of which, seuerall instances might easilie be produced: yet this practise of theirs hath neuer bin so much vsed or so earnestly pursued as in these present tymes. For as it is well knowne that their Captaine & Antesignane Luther strucke his firste stroake at the Pope & Churches power to graunt indulgences, so is it also apparent by experience, that all his followers continue the same battle with all their strenght & stratagems. For proofe of which wee need goe no further then to this our aduersarie. Who throu' his whole workes laboureth nothing more then to diminish the lustre, & power of the Catholike Roman Church; in so much that in this verie section he maketh choise rather to lay violent hands vpon the sacred Bible, & shamefullie to corrupt three seuerall places

of

of the diuine ſcripture then faile of his purpoſe, or want colour for his peruerſe intent, which to the end the reader may more plainelie vnderſtand I will particularlie reherſe.

The firſte place therefore conſiſtsin diuers paſſages of the epiſtle to the Romans eſpecially in the fiſte chapter, where that which the Apoſtle by way of admonition ſpeaketh onely to thoſe particular Chriſtians & members of the Church which were then at Rome, exhorting them to be conſtant in their faith & humble themſelues leaſt God cut them of for their ſinnes as he did the Iewes; the knight doth violentlie drawe it to the who Roman Church, as if S. Paul did intimate t: : had a poſſibilitie of falling, & conſequentli: was but a particular Church, feygning alſo that ſainct Paul did therefore pray for the continuance & ſtabilitie of the Roman faith, as if ſaith Sir Humfrey. he had for ſeene by the ſpirit of propheſie they would glorie in their owne merites: all which is quite repugnant to the meaning of the text, as the reader may eaſilie perceaue. And the like abuſe of the knight the reader may ſee in other places which he cites to the ſame purpoſe viz. to proue that the Romane Church is faileable as 1. Theſſal. 8. 2. Theſſal. 3. 1. Tim. 3. 15. Epheſ. 5. 14. In all which places he vſeth much of his accuſtomed craft peruerting the ſenſe moſt ſacrilegiouſlie

in

in all thoſe ſacred texts, & in the firſte to the Corinthians he falſifieth the wordes, putting *thou* for *vs*, the particulars of which I am ſorie I cannot ſtande to examine, to the end his groſſe couſenage might more cleerlie appeare, and how vnder coulour of ſcriptures the ſacred word of God & truth is adulterated euen by him who ſo much braggeth & glorieth in it.

After this ſame fashion he eludeth two pregnant places of Fathers for the authoritie of the Church the one is of Sainct Cypr. lib. 1. epiſt. 3. the other is of ſainct Auguſtine contra epiſt. fund. cap. 5. & to coulore his euaſion about the wordes of ſainct Auguſtine which are theſe, *Euangelio non crederem niſi Eccleſiæ Catholicæ me commoueret authoritas*, he citeth Canus lib. 2. cap. 8. as if this author did fauore his falſe interpretation of ſainct Auguſtines meaning; who neuertheleſſe (beſides that his wordes are not cited home by Sir Humfrey) he onelie affirmes that ſainct Auguſtine did not intend in that place to make the Church the formall reaſon why an infidell or one lately conuerted beleiues the Ghoſpell, but onelie the neceſſarie condition of his beleife of the Canonicall ſcriptures; which doctrine of Canus makes nothing at all for our aduerſaries intent in this place, which is to diſproue the infallible authoritie of the Catholike Church,

Præterea Eccleſia quæ nunc eſt in fide errare non poteſt ergo ſi credideris aliquem librum eſſe canonicum ex eius teſtimonio id teneas, firmumque ſumetur à Theologis argumentur. Canon lib. 2. c. 7.

which

Lib.7.de Canon.c. 10. which Canus doth not denie, but profeſſedlie maintayneth & particularlie in the verie precedent chapter in other places in a moſt Catholike manner.

To this purpoſe the knight alſo cites Durand, Driedo, & Gerſon, but rehearſeth not their wordes which notobſtāding I haue ſeene cited by Chamier; but if they be truly & ſincerelie vnderſtood, they conuince nothing againſt the infallible authoritie of the Church, as neyther the wordes of ſainct Thomas who onelie affirmeth that ſainct Auguſtine ſpeakes of the Church as an oueruling cauſe, but not as the foundation of faith, which no Romaniſts denies, but all vniformely teach that their faith is founded vpon the word of God, whoſe onelie authoritie is the ſupreme rule of the ſame, but the Church the proponent onelie.

In the reſt of his ſection Sir Humfrey makes a diuerſion to the vniuerſalitie of the Church for which he onely produceth ſome impertinent reaſons of no force with the authorities of the Councells of Ferrara & Baſill, waldenſis & others, none of which proues any thing appertayning to the matter in treaty, but onely ſerue to patch vp this part of his bypath, in which I leaue him.

Sec. 19 The 19. ſection followeing affirmeth that the Church is finally reſolued into the Pope, whome

whome saith the kinght the Romanists make the husband & the spouse, the head, & the bodie of the Church. This man is so full of falsity & vntruth that it seemes his whole liuing is by lyeing, I am perswaded he hath had his breeding in brasen faced College where impudency & vntruth are the cheefe lessons in the schooles. And heere the kinght hath in a manner gone beyonde if not beside himself in that faculty. For I finde no lesse then there lyes euen with in the narrow limits of the title of his section: nay there is not any one part or parcell of it true, by which alone althou' the reader might make a strong coniecture of the rest, yet will I giue him an instance or two in particular which doubtlesse will quite conuince his iudgment of the authors knauish dealing.

In his 502. page, now at last saith he, they haue made him (meaning the Pope) the whole Church in so much that some are not ashamed to professe that the Pope may dispense against the Apostles, yea against the new testament vppon good cause, & also against all the precepts of the old. This lye is so exorbitant & monstrous, that it seemes he who made it doubted it would not be taken vppon his owne bare word, wherfore he fled to the authority of his frend Iewell whome he quotes in the margent to make it more authenticall, as if that famous

Father

Father of falſe dealing could ſufficiently ſupply all that which in that nature is wanting in himſelf. But I hope the iudicious reader will regiſter them both in one predicament & giue no more credit to the one then the other, but ſend them togeather to the whetſtone.

Another inſtance I giue the reader out of the 504. page, where the knight chargeth Bellarmine to teach that if the Pope should ſo much erre as to command vices & forbid virtues, the Church were bound to beleiue that vices are good & virtues euill, vnleſſes she will ſinne againſt her conſcience. It is true the Cardinall hath the ſame wordes which Sir Humfrey cites hitherto, but yet he vſeth moſt dishoneſt & double dealing, in regare that if he had either rehearſed the whole place intirely as it lieth in Bellarmine, or elſe had veiwed his recognition, he might eaſily haue found the authors true meaning to be, not that in generall & euery matter & all occaſions, but onely that in doubtful caſes & in things not neceſſarily good or ill of themſelues, & in matters indifferent, ſuch obedience is to be giuen to the Pope, leaſt otherwiſe men should proceed againſt their conſciences, & therfore ſaith he, *Si Papa*, If the Pope should command that which is cleerly knowne to be a vice, or should prohibite that which is cleerly knowne to be a virtue, then we ought rather to obey God

then

then men. And so we see, that taking away the imposture & cousinage of the knight, there is nothing in Bellarmines doctrine that may either iustly offend the reader, or that makes for the purpose heere intended of proving that the Pope ought to be obeyed whether his doctrine be true or false, as our aduersary doth falsely & calumniously affirme. All the rest which the knight hath in this section is onely sophisticall fopperies & crackes of his crazed braine abusing the doctrine of diuers Romanists & framing such sense to their words as cõmeth neerest to his owne purpose & is farthest from theirs, & so falsely fathering it vpon them, & confounding the faith of the whole Church with matters disputable & in opinion, he concludes discourse of all which let the reader consider whether the Romanists or he himself rather be not in the by-way he hath fallaciously framed for his aduersaries.

In the section following which is the 20. in order, he affirmes, that the Church, which he saith is resolued finally into the Pope, hath neither personall nor doctrinall succession, neyther in matter of faith nor fact. Sec. 20.

It appeeres by the knights proceedings in this whole section, that he hath met with his greatest enimie against whome he vseth all his art & cunning hoping to haue the maistrie by

striking most stronglie at the head that is the Pope, whome to make his bloue the fuller, he feignes to be the whole bodie, & like a venemous spider gathering poyson from the fragat flowers of the Roman doctrine spits the verie quintessence of it against his sacred person. Yet a great part of his matter is but loathsome inculcations of that which he hath a hundred times repeated, & which haue binne as often ansfeared by my selfe & others. But because his importunitie is so great, I will giue the reader a taste, thou' I confesse it is most tedious vnto me to eate so often of the same Crambe.

The knights cheife plot in this place is by confronting the doctrine of the ancient Popes not onelie in matters of fact, but of faith also with the moderne doctrine of the Roman Churches & Popes, he beginnes with priuate Masse saying that Pope Anacletus did decree that after consecration, all present should communicate according as the Apostles set downe, & the Roman Church then obserued. Now this Sir Humfrey compareth with the doctrine of the late Councell of Trent, which determines, vnder paine of excommunication, that Masses in which the Preists alone communicates are not vnlawfull or to be abrogated; as if this decree were contrarie to the other, which directlie it is not, for that althou' the wordes of Anaclet doe shewe the common

cuſtome of his time, yea & of the Church of his time (notwithſtanding they alſo inſinuate that the contrarie had binne practiſed at the leaſt in ſome places) to haue binne that all preſent at Maſſe did *de facto* communicate, yea & that thoſe, that did not should be put out: Yet in regard the Councell of Trent doth neyther denie nor diſſallowe of that cuſtome (nay rather expreſlie deſires the continuation of it) but onelie defineth that ſuch Maſſes as are celebrated without more communicants beſides the Preiſt are not to be condemned & abollished as the clamorous ſectaries of our daies doe contend, it is more then euident that there is no contrarietie to be founde betweene the one & the other, nor more then if the ſame Councell had defined, that thoſe Communions are not vnlawfull, or not to be condemned in which infants are not admitted to receaue the Sacrament, notobſtanding the cuſtome was in the primitiue Church to admitte them. To omitte that Sir Humfrey is verie ignorant in the doctrine of the Roman Church if he knoweth not that aithou' in matters of faith there can be no chaunge, yet in matters of manners alteration may be made; ſo that according to diuerſitie of times, places, & perſons, that which once hath binne practiſed yea & commanded by one Pope & Councell at one time, may be otherwiſe practiſed in another, & that with-

but anie preiudice, but rather with great profit (in some cases) to the vniuersal Church which doctrine because the knight wanteth eyther witt or will to conceiue it rightlie, he runneth a madding throu' his whole section vpon an erroneous supposition prouing nothing but his owne spleene against the Pope, & want of vnderstanding, & iudgement.

And in this same Frantick fashion he dealeth with sainct Gregorie in his 9. epistle of the Register; & the Bull of Pius quartus concerning images, equiuocating in the word *adoration*, which by reason holie S. Gregorie takes it for diuine honour, he teacheth with great reason, that althou' images may be lawfullie made & vsed with due reuerence as he sheweth in another place, yet they cānot be lawfullie adored in the other sense. From whence Sir Humfrey will needes collect that the moderne Pope Pius contradicteth that which his famous predecessor did teach before him, in that he declareth according to the doctrine of the Tridentine Counceil, due honour & veneration is to be giuen to the images of Christe & his saintes in which neuertheless there is no contrarietie at all, but rather great agreement & conformitie not onelie in the matter it selfe, but euen in their manner of speech.

And by these two pointes which are the cheife matter of moment which our aduersarie

hath

hath in this section, the reader may easilie cõiecture of the rest; & if besides this, if he doth but marke how deceitfully he dealeth with Bellarmine in the conclusiõ of this section about the succession of the Popes to S. Peter, I am perswaded he will neuer trust Puritan writer as long as he liues. But note the impostors subtletie, that which Bellarmine sayth of the immoueable placing of the seate of saint Peter at Rome by Christes appointment which he affirmes not to be a matter of faith or immutable precept of God, this honest disputant applies it to the absolute being of saint Peter at Rome & the seating of his chaire ther, & then vpon this false & detorted vnderstanding of his doctrine, inferreth as from his owne confession that therefore at the best it can be but probable that the Pope should succeed Peter in that seat, & there is no cause for to beleiue it, for that Bellarmine saith it is not point of faith, & that if Christe gaue anie such precept, it may be changed, thus the knight. And yet the truth is that in none of those places the Cardinall speaches of the succession of the Pope to saint Peter, but only of the certaintie of the connexion of the Apostolicall seate with the particular Roman Church, & whether the one is so vnited & ioyned to the other that it cannot be transferred to another place viz. to Antioch where saint Peter did reste

for a time abide, or to some other Episcopall seate of the Catholike Church, which Bellarmine affirmes not to be a point of faith or immutable diuine precept: but of the infallibility of the succession of the Pope in the seate of S. Peter he makes no doubt, but constantlie defends it to be a matter of faith & diuine institution as is manifest by his owne wordes in the 12. chapter of his second booke de Rom. Pont. where he saith expresselie *Successio Romani Pontificis in Pontificatu Petri ex institutione Christi est*, & a little after *Si quis tamen petat an iure diuino Romanus Pontifex Pastor sit & caput totius Ecclesiæ, omnino id esse asserendum*. And now by these plaine wordes of Bellarmine it manifestlie appeereth he is so farre from standing vpon probabilities in the point of succession of the Pope to saint Peter, that all those places which the knight cites out of the second & fourth booke de Rom. Pont. as that, *non est improbabile Dominum iussisse vt Petrus sedem suam Romæ figeret*. And, *non est de fide diuina & immutabili præcepto Romæ sedem Petri esse constitutam; est tamen probabilissimum & pie credendum*. And those other wordes, *forte non est de iure diuino Romanum Pontificem Petro succedere*. And those, *Ius successionis Romanorum Pontificum in eo fundatur quod Petrus Romæ suam sedem fixerit*. All those places of which the knight makes a praye to deceiue his reader, are

spoken

ſpoken not of the ſucceſſion, but of the reaſon of the ſucceſſion, of the Pope to the Apoſtle Sainct Peter: for Bellarmine doth expreſſelie diſtinguish in the ſame place ſaying, *aliud eſſe ſucceſſionem aliud rationem ſucceſſionis*: & the firſte which is the ſucceſſion, he teaches cleerlie to be by the inſtitution of Chriſte; but the manner of the ſame ſucceſſion that is the reaſon wherefore the Biſhop of Rome rather then the Biſhop of Antioch or anie other doth ſucceed S. Peter in that Seat hath it's beginning from the fact of Peter: But Bellarmine neyther in anie place of thoſe cited by Sir Humfrey nor in anie other affirmes that the right of ſucceſſion is founded in the fact of Peter: But this was the craft of our ſubtle Knight whereby he might inferre that the fact of Peter being no matter of faith, but at the moſt of morall certaintie, the whole frame of the Roman religion might therefore ſeeme to be doubtfull & vncertaine. And to this end he falſelie applied to the ſucceſſion it ſelfe that which by Bellarmine was ſpoken onelie of the manner of the ſame ſucceſſion. From which vniuſt proceeding of Sir Humfrey we may gather by the way, that there is no dealing with theſe people but at hand blowes, I meane by producing of the bookes out of which they make their allegations, otherwiſe if they can but ſcape without

examen they will make no scruple to cousen their owne Fathers as experience hath already taught vs.

To conclude I assure the reader that the rest of the matter in this place is but such doathsome stuffe as this, mingled with so many impudent vntruthes that I am not able to recount them seuerallie. All which because I perceaue the more it is stirred the more it sinkes, I will leaue it to himselfe to make the best he can of it, & if by corruption & fraude he will needes build a by-way for vs Romanists, he doth but labor in vayne, since that he can no sooner finish it, but that we can as soone returne it vpon himselfe & fellowes.

Sec. 21. In the next section which is the 21. the knight treateth of the Popes iudgment, which he saith is not yet certaine & agreed vpon among the Romanists, notwithstanding it is by them made the rule of faith.

In this section I finde nothing meritorious of a scholers labour either in reading it or answering it, for it is but an idle continuation of the authors former fooleries concerning the Popes authority in the determination of matters of faith, which on the one side he will needes haue it so that the Romanists hold his iudgment for an infallible rule of faith, & yet he himself citts diuers Romanists which doe not hold the Popes authority to be infallible,

which in my opinion is no lesse then playne dotage. For who is he, if he be not quite depriued of iudgment doth not conceiue that if there are Romanists which doe not defend the Popes authority to be infallible there must of necessity be also some, yea & the same Romanists that hold his iudgment not to be an infallible rule of faith; from whence it doth further necessarily ensue that the infallibility of the Popes iudgment in determining Controuersies is no point of faith among Romanists, how be it is commonly held for the most safe doctrine, & consequently as the proposition of the title of this section is but a fallacious paradox of the knights owne inuenting, so are all the authorities & proofes which he produceth to shewe that there is vncertainty among the Romanists of the Popes infallible iudgment in the rule of faith in vaine & of no force, extending to demonstrate that which is not denied by all Catholike diuines. And thus Sir Humfrey marcheth on in the by-way of his owne deuised fancies euen to the end of this section, neuer omitting to exercise himself by the way in some part of impiety, against the Popes, carping maliciously at the building of some of them in particular: all which how true or false it is (yet not doubting but that they haue bin much calumniated by emulators & heretiques & ill aduised persons as by the writers of their liues

liues appeereth, I cannot heere ſtand to examine by reaſon I ſtudy & profeſſe breuity, but will onely anſwere generally with pious S. Auguſtine in the like caſe of obiectiō touching the Popes which liued before& in his time, that although ſome traytor had cript in to that order of Biſhops which is deduced from Peter himſelf to Anaſtaſius, (I ſay to vrbanius) who doth now ſit in the ſame chaire, yet ſhould he not preiudice the Church & the innocent Chriſtians to whome our prouident Lord ſayd Doe what they ſay, but doe not what they doe.

Sect. 22. In the 22. ſection the knight affirmes that the Church vppon which the learned Romaniſts grounde their faith is onely the Pope but the Church vppon which the vnlearned rely is no other then their pariſhe preiſtes.

It is iuſt ſo, why? becauſe *ipſe dixit* becauſe Sir Humfrey ſayd it. But how doth he knowe it to be ſo by ſcripture or by tradition? if by ſcripture, let him turne his Bible & produce the text: if by tradition, he is a traytor to his owne cauſe. One ſaid pleſantly, that the faith of a Puritan is reſolued *1. in Biblia 2. in ſpiritum, 3. in carnem*, firſte into the Bible, ſecondly into the ſpirit, thirdly into the flesh; & heere reſts the laſt reſolution of their religion.

But now ſeriouſly to the matter, but indeed there is little matter except by matter we vnderſtand

derstand corruption, & of this I am certaine there is no want. For to begin with the title of the sectiō, it hath two partes & they both false: the one is that the learned Romanists ground their faith vppon no other then the Pope; the other that the vnlearned rely vppon no other then their parish prestes, neyther of which is absolutely true as experience doth teach. And yet if it were true that the simple sort of people did rely wholy vppon their Parish preistes, what then? may not simple Romanists as safely rely vppon their Parish preistes as simple reformers vppon their Parish ministers, who are sometimes euen as simple & ignorant in diuinity as themselues, setting aside that perhaps they are a little more expert in reading the text of the Bible in English, or a misreformed homilie. And touching the learned Romanists they doe not rely vpon the Pope onely, but chiefly vpon the word of God as also the most simple Romanists doe shou' not interpred according to their owne priuate sense as the pretended reformers doe, but ed pounded according to the consent & commonly receiued sense of the vniuersall visible Church.

To this I adde a most odious & slanderous Page 573.
ye of the knight where he saith of the beleife of the Romanists that if it be receiued with an affected ignorance & a blind obedience, the partie shall be saued by the fire of Purgatory,

which

which is most palpably false, & neuer affirmed by any Romanist, but coyned by his owne froathie braine, besides this & the like dishoneſt dealing he abuſeth Bellarmine in diuers places, as lib. 1. de iuſtif. cap. 7. in which place whereas Bellarmine produceth S. Bernards expoſitio of thoſe wordes of Iob, *the oxē did plowe & labore, the aſſes did feed by them*, to proue againſt ſectaries, that iuſtifieing faith conſiſts not ſo much in knowledge as in aſſent, ſaying, *docet Bernardus*, Bernard teacheth that by the oxen are vnderſtood the learned doctors of the Church, by the aſſes are meant the ignorant, which by their ſimple beleife reſt ſatisfied in the vnderſtanding of their ſuperiors: nimble Sir Humfrey applying this (though very fondly & prepoſterouſly) to the diſprofe of the ignorant peoples relying vppon their paſtors in their faith by changing the word *docet*, *he ſayth*, (meaning S. Bernard) in to thoſe wordes *the Cardinall*, ſaith he, makes his reader beleiue that the foreſayd expoſition is Bellarmines owne gloſſe, whereas yet he doth but alledge it out of S. Bernard only to confirme his owne doctrine touching the nature of the forme of iuſtification.

Another place the knight corrupts in the ſame Bellarmine lib. 3. de Euchar. cap. 9. concerning the doctrine of Peter Lombard, & S. Thomas, where the Cardinall affirming that

they

they were not carefull of the question now in controuersie, to wit whether that which the Preist celebrateth daily be properly a sacrifice, but supposed the affirmatiue part as a thing knowne to all men; the crafty Cauallier relates the wordes of Bellarmine so transuersly that the reader cannot but vnderstand by them that the Cardinall affirmes that those two most famous diuines cared not whether the Masse were a proper sacrifice or no; but that they did onely content themselues to hold that it is a commemoratiue sacrifice onely, as the reformers teach. And now let these examples suffice to demonstrate the infidelity of our aduersarie in this section: to omit much other impertinent false & captious matter & allegations, diuers of which I haue answered in my censure, & are heere superfluously repeated by the knight towards the building of this part of his crooked & blinde by-way, which as you see by the matterialls of it, is so fowle & rugged that it is not fit for any person of reputation to appeere in it.

The next section is the 23. in number affirming that the visibilitie of the Church is no certaine note of the true Church but rather the contrarie thus Sir Humfrey; but he that should duelie consider how farre euen by his owne confession he is ingaged to the Iesuit his aduersarie to proue his owne Church to haue Sec. 23.

binne

binne visible in all former ages since the Apostles times till this day, doubtlesse he would much wonder at this his title: altho' if contrarilie he ponder how slowe the same Sir Humfrey hath binne in the performance of his answer to that challenge, then he would instantlie cease to maruell, perswading himselfe that the knight hauing better considered of the matter, he is resolued vpon a contrarie course as it may now more then probably appeere by the contents of this present section in which he professeth to impugne that same visibilitie which so manie daies, monethes, & yeeres agoe, he solemlie auouched to make good viz. the succession of his owne Church. I for my part am verie sorrie that the knight hath so altered his designe in regard I haue long since had a vehement desire to haue a sight thou' it were onelie *tanquam per speculum in anigmat*, as in a perspectiue or astronomicall glasse, of those faire faces which haue lien in lauender so manie hundreth yeeres together; yet now I perceiue there is no remedie but patience, & so I will leaue those inordinate desires, & examine how soundlie the author proceedes in the impugnation of that which according to his promise he ought rather to defend then confute.

Wherefore to the intent he may seeme to haue sayd some thing to the purpose, he stateth

the

the question in another sense thē that in which it is disputed betwixt the Romanists & the reformers, he putteth the case in a conspicuous & eminent visibilitie of the Church in all ages perpetuallie. And this visibilitie I graunt diuers of the testimonies which he produceth doe proue not to be necessarie to the true Church: neyther doe I denie that the proofes our aduersarie bringeth, if is suppositiō of such a glorious visibilitie were true, but this is out of the quire; for the question is onelie whither such visibilitie is a certaine note of the true Church as that in all times some at the least true professors of it may be assigned & named: & this kinde of visibilitie of the true Church is not disproued by all, or anie one of the testimonies which are heere alleaged by the knight, but all of them are in vaine produced. But now as he himself doth name Adam, Abel, Enoch, Noe, Abraham, Lot, Tobias, Ieremy, Simeon, Anna, Ioseph, Marie, Elizabeth, to which diuers others might be added in euerie seuerall age, I say as he could & did name these visible professors of the old lawe, so doe we demaund of him to shewe & name vs in like manner some professors in euery seuerall age before the daies of Luther who haue professed the same religion in all pointes which is now professed in the pretensuely reformed Churches. For this is the true state of the question betwixt vs, & this

is

is that which we hold for a necessarie note of the true Church, & as we are readie at all times to performe this, yea & some of vs haue alreadie performed it long since in proofe of the visibilitie of the Roman Church, so doe we expect the like from the defenders of the reformed Church in proofe of the visibilitie of the same. And to deale plainlie, till Sir Humfrey or some bodie for him performes this taske, & in this sense, what soeuer he or his companions eyther doe or can produce to impugne the visibilitie of our Church, we hold it for a meere by-way inuented onelie to auoide that difficultie which absolutelie in their vnderstanding they iudge insuperable, & impossible to be cleared.

Sec. 24. In the next section which is the 24. the knight prosecuteth the same matter that is the visibilitie of the Church in the new testament; but he walkes quite out of the true way from the beginning to the ending. He pretends to shewe that the Church hath not binne conspicuouslie visible but latent & obscure in all ages, & yet to demonstrate this he produceth nothing but such testimonies as proue there haue binne euer mahie heresies scismes, persecutions & people of ill life, which haue so much darkened the splēdor of the true Church that it was sometimes vnder cloudes & mistes, proning with a multitude of testimonies with

great

great ostentation that which we Romanists doe not denie: nay we all ingenuouslie confesse that the true Church must not of necessitie be alwayes eminentlie & flowrishinglie visible, yet neuer so obscure & couered which cloudes, but that the professors of it may be found & named euen in the middest of her greatest mists, for we say with saint Ambrose, *videtur sicut luna deficere sed non deficit*, She seemes to faile like the moone, but she doth not faile, *obumbrari potest, perire non potest*, she may be obscured but she cannot perish; so that in this section Sir Humfrey in steed of an egge giues vs a Scorpion, & in lieu of prouing the Church, to haue binne so obscure & latent that none of her members can be found & named, he onelie or cheeflie produceth the errors & heresies of those who did most impugne & obscure her: nay it seemes his passion did so much transport him, that rather then faile of his purpose of impugning the absolute visibilitie of the Church in all ages, he layeth violent hands euen vpon the holie Apostles, accusing them that they erred both in doctrine & manners as in his 611. page the reader may see in plaine termes, to omit that all or most of the authors which he cites are eyther of his owne profession, or obtruded in among the Romanists, as for example Morney, Erasmus, Cassander, & other suppositious writers, or else

Li. 4. Hex. cap. 2.

In so much, as both those who were called, & those who Where chosen by Christ, did erre grieuously both in manners & doctrine &c. By-way page. 611.

elſe ſuch pious Catholikes, as out of their zeale haue iuſtlie reprehended the priuate errors, & abuſes of particular perſons (thou' in generall termes as the cuſtome is) which haue in ſeuerall ages like darnell among corne ſprung vp in the feild of the viſible Church; & this being the ſubſtance of the contents of this ſection, I remitte it to the reader to iudge whether the knight hath not runne an extrauagant & by courſe for the building of this parcell of his by way.

Sect. 25. In the 25. ſection vpon a ſuppoſition of the declination of faith & manners in the Roman Church which he falſely ſuppoſeth as proued in his former ſection, our aduerſarie proceedes to an application of certaine places of ſcripture to the ſame ſuppoſed declination of the Pope & Church, but ſo ridiculouſly & corruptedly, that on the one ſide a man of iudgment that reades it will hardly abſteine from laughter: But on the contrarie he will be ſorie to ſee the diuine word of God ſo profaned & abuſed eſpeciallie by thoſe who ſo much bragg of the ſcriptures that they will ſcarce vouchſafe to read anie other booke but pure Bible. And to the end the knights counterfeit proceeding in this particular may appeere, I will reherſe one inſtance or two that by them the reader may conſider of the reſt. Page 670. how comes it to paſſe (ſaith he) that the number of the faithfull

full are so few; that at all times, they cannot easily be discerned? His answere is, because it was foretold in the 18. of saincte Luke, that when the sonne of man, commeth he shall not finde faith vpon the earth: marke the wisdome of this great Salomon & admire it. S. Luke as his wordes doe plainelie testifie, speakes & propheſies of the time of the comming of our Sauiour to iudge the world at the day of the generall iudgment, & yet Sir Humfrey most absurdlie, abusedlie, & falselie applyes them to that vast Caos or large space of time, which hath passed since the time of the Apostles to the dayes of Luther; yea & as it seemes by his discourse euen to the time of Christs comming to iudgment in the end of the world: as if according to his reformed Logike this were a good consequence, when the sonne of man commeth he shall not finde faith vpon the earth, therefore the number of the faithfull is so smale that at all times they cannot easily be discerned: ô acute & subtile Logician! & in my opiniõ much fitter for the carte thẽ the schoole of Dialect. Another example I giue the reader in two places cited by the knight, the one out of the 2. of Peter 2. chap. the other out of the 18. of the Reuel. 3. verse which he applyeth to Indulgences & pardons saying in his page 671. how comes it to passe that Indulgences & pardons are graunted for monie & made the trea-

ſure of their Church? Becauſe ſayth he it was foretold there ſhall be falſe teachers among you by whome the way of truth ſhall be ill ſpoken of & throu' couetouſnes ſhall with fayned wordes make marchandiſe of you. Now it is true the place out of ſainct Peter thou' falſelie & fondlie applyed, & might farre more fitly be accommodated to the pretenſiue reformed Puritanicall Nouelliſts whoſe greateſt part of ſchollership si to rayle at the Pope & Roman Church, yet it is not vntrulie rehearſed, but in the place quoted out of the Apocalips, there is not one title to this purpoſe, excepting that the Apoſtle once nameth the word merchants; which neuertheleſſe, according to the true ſenſe of the text, maketh no more to the matter in hand, then if he had named the word miniſter.

The reſt of the places of ſcripture which he cites according to the common & current expoſition of the Roman Church euen at this preſent, are vnderſtood partly of the precurſors of Antichriſt which are the heretikes & perſecutors in generall of all ages: & partly of that great Antichriſte properly ſo called, whoſe comming all true Catholikes haue euer expected onely about the end or conſummation of the world: howbeit if a man were delighted in trifles & trickes he might much more commodiouſly applie thoſe ſame places

to

to Luther & his sequaces, as hauing their pedigree & discent from seuerall heretikes of former times, then eyther to the Pope or Church of Rome, as may also plainly appeere by the 39. articles of the new Creed of England, of which excepting those fewe that agree with the doctrine of the Catholike Church, there is scarce any that haue not binne defended by other heretikes of more ancient standing, as diuers learned Romanists haue demonstrated in their seuerall treatises. By all which it doth appeere that althou' Sir Humfrey hath vsed no other proofes in this section then the pure text of scripture, yet hath he made so bad vse of it that all the world may cleerly perceiue that he is entred much further into his by-way then he was before.

The 26. followeing is the conclusion of the treatise, in which the author laboreth to Sec. 26. showe the safety & certainty of his owne way, & the vncertainty of the Romish way; This is the whole drift & scope not of this section onely but of the whole worke, as being a breife summe of the same.

I confesse that if the Romanists were bound to giue credit to Sir Humfrey *linds* bare word in matters of faith & maners, then they ought of necessity to yeald him the safe way & content themselues with the by: but they are otherwise taught & instructed, they knowe

that for the ſpace of aboue 14. hundred yeeres togeather they had vnqueſtionable poſſeſſion of the ſafe way to ſaluation, & may iuſtly ſay with ancient Tertullian. *Nos prius poſſidimus*, we had firſte poſſeſſion, why then ſhould we yeald vnto you & take the by-way which you haue framed & inuented of later yeeres? nay why ſhould we not rather with the ſame Tertullian boldly demaund of you who are, according to the ſayeing of another ancient father, prodigiouſly borne of your ſelues *Quieſtis vos? vnde & quando veniſtis? vbi tamdiu latuiſtis?* who are you? from whence & when did you come? where haue you layne hid ſo long time? & with S. Hierome *Quiſquis es aſſector nouorum dogmatum queſo vt parcas Romanis auribus, parcas fidei quæ apoſtolico ore laudata eſt* who ſoeuer thou art that art a defender of new doctrine I beſeech the ſpare the Roman eares, ſpare that faith which is commended by the Apoſtles owne mouth: & in another place. *Cur poſt 400. annos docere nos niteris quod ante neſciuimus?* why after 400. yeeres (I may ſay after 1400. yeeres, doe you goe about to teach vs that which before we knew not? & with optatus, *veſtræ Cathedræ originem oſtendite qui vobis vultis ſanctam Eccleſiam vendicare.* Shew the origen of your chaire, you that callenge to your ſelues the holie Church: wherfore if you vnder pretence of a reformation will enter into poſſeſ-

ſion

sio of the safe way, if you will claime the truth, & leaue falsehood for vs, it is not sufficient for you with a plausible flourish of speech (as you vse heere Sir Humfrey) to say so it is, but you most firste proue your claime & conuince your title, & that not by accusation of vs (that which you haue onely performed through both your bookes) for, *si accusasse sufficiat quis erit innocens?* if to accuse be sufficient who will be innocent? but by positiue proofes of your owne, which as yet neyther you, nor any of your copemates haue euer performed. You pretend sole scripture for your euidence, but in place of Gods word you obtrude vnto vs your owne glosses & captious illations & sophiticall inferences or deductions, & you for your part Sir Humfrey, you knowe you are ingaged by promise to answere the Iesuites challenge, which is not as you affirme (hoping so to scape the brunt of the battell, to proue out of some good authors that the Protestant Church (so you please to call it for matter of state, althou' yours, as I suppose is not truly the Protestant, but the Puritan Church) was all waies visible; which althou' I knowe I haue made manifest that as yet you haue not performed that taske neyther, I am confident, euer will be able to performe the same, yet that is not truly the Iesuites challendge, but that you produce some which haue

profeſſed your religion in euery point, & in euery age before the daies of Luther. This is the charge you haue vndertaken, & till you haue diſcharged your ſelfe of this, your honor ſtill remaines at the ſtake, & for all your bragges your ſafe way is to the Romaniſts & all other of mature iudgment, but onely a by-way, & ſerueth onely for a cowardly excuſe of your want of abillitie to performe your promiſe.

But now to returne to the contents of this ſection in particular from which I haue in ſome ſort digreſſed. I ſay it conſiſts onely in a recapitulation of thoſe ſeuerall pointes of controuerſie which I haue alreadie examined, in confirmation of which ſince the author hath produced nothing which I haue not ſufficiently confuted & conuinced to be of no force, but all eyther falſe equiuocall or impertinent, it is moſt apparent that what ſoeuer he from hence collecteth by way of concluſion is noe concluſion, nor of any more authority then his owne bare affirmations or negations, & conſequently notobſtanding the vaine knight will needes ſeeme to haue the victorie & to haue gained his cauſe, yet I make no doubt but that the prudent reader will rather iudge in fauour of the anſerer then of the abiector, eſpecially conſidering how farre more eaſie a matter it is for any man to impugne the doctrine of another

then

then to defend his owne.

Wherfore I ioyne issue with myne aduersaries opposing the doctrine of the Roman Church to those same positions of the pretended reformed Churches which the knight hath heere sett downe, applying the same to the safe way & by-way as he hath donne, by-way of antithesis or oppositiue comparison betwixt them both in the manner followeing.

And firste I say; The Romanists teach that not scripture onely, but scripture with diuine & Apostolicall traditions receaued for such by the vniuersall Church in all ages, the approued generall Councells, & the infallible authority of the perpetually visible Church of God are the onely certaine meanes & safe way to saluation. But Sir Humfrey with his complices teach that scripture onely interpreted otherwise them by authoritie of the most vniuersallie florishing Church according to perpetual tradition of the Fathers & doctors of the same is sufficient to saluation, & this is a doubtfull & by way.

Secondly the Romanists teach that the scriptures are a most certaine a most safe & perfect rule of faith, yet in some places obscure & ambiguous as euen some of their aduersaryes confesse, & therfore it is not sufficient alone, but requires the authority of the true Church commended in the same scripture as an infal-

lible

lible interpreter; & this is a safe way to saluation: but the Reformers teach that the scripture with the interpretation & conference of one place with another by euerie priuate man or woman that can but reade it, is a sure euident & perfect rule of faith, & this is an vncertaine & by-way.

Thirdly, the Romanists teach that traditions appertayning to faith or manners receiued from Christe by his Apostles or from the Apostles themselues by inspiration of the holie Ghost, & as such conserued in the Church by continuall succession, are to be imbraced & reuerenced with like pious affection as the scriptures; & this is a safe way to saluation: but the reformers teach that onelie those traditions concerning faith & manners that can be proued by scriptures of which sort they denie anie to be in the Church notobstanding saint Paul in the scripture expresselie commandeth the Thessalonians to hold his traditions deliuered vnto them by word of mouth or by epistle. And this is an vncertaine & by way.

Fourthly the Romanists teach that the vniforme consent of vndoubted Fathers is to be followed in the interpretation of scriptures & some certaine persons in the Church as professors of diuinitie & some others for the auoyding of noueltie in doctrine, take an oath of the same: & moreouer that where they finde

that

that consent, they are to receaue it as a certaine rule for the true expounding of the scriptures without contradiction or inuention of other new sense or glosses, & this is a safe way to saluation: but the reformers teach that the vniforme consent of vndoubted Fathers is to be followed onelie so farre as according to their priuate spirit or iudgment they agree with scriptures, which is a captious & deceitfull rule of expounding them: And this is an vncertaine & by-way.

Fiftly the Romanists teach that the Christian Catholike Church is a congregation or companie of people beleiuing & professing the true faith of Christe vnder one cheife head our Sauiour Iesus Christe & his vicar in earth the Pope or Bishop of Rome as cheife Pastor & visible gouernour of the same vnder Christe, sayeing with all that the notes whereby the true Church is knowne from all other heretical & scismaticall conuenticles are not onelie & cheiflie exteriour splendour, amplitude, & miracles, as our aduersarie doth deceitfullie insinuate; but principallie the name Catholike, antiquitie, continuall succession &c. And this is a certaine & safe way: but the reformers teach the Church is a Congregation of pastours & people without anie certaine & infallible authoritie & assigning for markes of the same that which is common to all congrega-

tions

tions euen of heretikes & schismatikes according to their seuerall opinions, as all & euerie one of them holding they haue the true word & Sacraments rightlie preached & administred in their conuenticles, which consequentlie can be no certaine markes of the true Church in particular, no more then the name of a Christian in generall can be an infallible note of a true beleiuer; & this is an vncertaine & by-way.

Sixtly the Romanists teach that Generall Councells by the Popes authoritie or approbation conuocated & confirmed are not onelie of great vse in the Church: But also of certaine & infallible power for the determination of all doubts & controuersies in religion which may arise in seuerall times & occasions, & this is a certaine & safe way: But the Reformers teach that Generall Councells althou' they say they be of great vse & authority in the Church to determine controuersies in religion, yet they hold them of vncertaine authoritie & subiect to errour both in faith & manners, & this is an vncertaine & by-way.

Seauenthly; the Romanists teach that the cheife rock & angular stone vpon which the Church is built is Christe the Sauiour of the world, yet they say with Christe himselfe that Peter is also in his kinde a rock vpon which he promised to build his Church, & this is a certaine

taine & safe way: But the reformers teach, that Christe alone is the onelie rock vpon which he built his Church which is repugnant to the expresse wordes of Christe in the scripture sayeing to Peter, *vpon this rocke will I build my Church*: & this is a diuerticle or by-way.

Eightly, the Romanists teach that the operation & effect of the Sacraments depend cheiflie & principallie vpon the institution of Christe, yet they say withall, that both for the securitie of the consciences & comfort of the receauers &c. The Preist must haue a sincere intention to minister, the Sacrament & not in leaft as Luther & some other sectaries doe teach & this is a certaine & safe way to saluation. But the Reformers teach that onelie the iustistitution of Christe is sufficient, & the Preists sincere intention not required, & this is an vncertaine & by-way.

Ninthly the Romanists teach, that Christe is our onelie mediatour of redemption, & who onelie of himself & by his owne power knoweth the secrets of our hartes; yet withall they say that his Saintes in heauen, who in & by him doe assuredlie knowe the secrets of our hartes in such things especiallie as cõcerne the good of our soules, are our mediatours of intercession, by offering our vnworthie prayers to God, & this is a certaintie & safe way to

salua-

ſaluation: But the reformers calle vpon Chriſte onelie & exclude & neglect his ſaintes & ſeruants whome neuertheleſſe he himſelfe doth promiſe to honore in heauen, condemning alſo for impious & ſacrilegious the ſaintes interceſſion for ſinners, which notwithſtanding he doth not condemne for ſuch in anie parte of holie ſcripture, & this is an vncertaine & by-way.

Tenthly the Romaniſts teach we ought to adore Chriſtes bodie preſent in heauen where he ſits on the right hand of his diuine Father, yet withall they ſay it is lawfull yea & we ought to adore him whereſoeuer he is, & particularlie in the bleſſed Sacrament of the Euchariſt, & this is a certaine & ſafe way to ſaluation: But the reformers teach that the bodie of Chriſte ought not to be adored in the Euchariſt but onelie in heauen, & this is an vncertaine & by-way.

Eleauenthly the Romaniſts as the word of God inſtructs them, confeſſe themſelues to be vnprofitable ſeruants in regarde neyther they nor their actions bring anie profitte to God who hath no need of anie thing, & yet they ſay withall that no man liuing can be iuſtified by his owne merits, that is ſuch merites as proceed purelie from his owne naturall forces & actions, & more then this that all thoſe who expect ſaluation muſt beleiue in Chriſte with a

liuelie

liuelie faith & wholely relie vpon his meritts & satisfaction as vpon the proper & principall cause of their saluation; yet they say besides this, that altho' they may not relie vpon their owne merits or the satisfactions of the saintes alone, neuertheless they may vse both the satisfaction of saintes & their owne merits as a meanes to saluation, by virtue & application of the merits & satisfaction of Christes passion, & also that they can by the grace & assistance of God obserue his commandements, yea & by virtue of the same diuine grace performe some workes of supererogation or not commanded by precept of God but counselled by his aduise, & this is a certaine & safe way to saluation: But the reformers teach they are vnprofitable seruants (which I confesse that in deed they are both to God & his Church as euer were anie in the world) & that no mans good workes altho' they proceed from the speciall grace of God can in anie sort iustifie him before God, & that euerie Christian must so wholie relie vpon the merites of Christe, that he beleiue also that no man can haue anie of his owne euen by the power & grace of God, & that he is bound to expect & hope for saluation without anie such workes or merites, meerlie by a sole & bare faith that his sinnes are remitted in Iesus Christe, & this is an vncertaine & by-way.

Heere

Heere yousee a plaine confrontment of di-
uers particular pointes of controuersie betwixt
the Romanists & the reformers by way of af-
firmation & negation, & because I knowe
that my aduersarie & I are not agreed of a
Iudge of our cause, I for for my part remit my
selfe to the indifferent reader as our onelie vm-
piere to determine of the matter not onelie for
as much as concernes the contents of this par-
ticular section, but also of the whole worke,
who if he consider with due ponderation the
proceedings of both parties, & compare the
sincere & plaine dealing which I haue vsed
with the insincere and double dealing of my
aduersarie, who hath so persevered in his indi-
rect courses that euen in the end & conclusion
of his worke he hath practised no smale par-
tialitie and fraude in the rehearsall of the do-
ctrine of the Roman Church, as particularlie
where he affirmes that the Romanists teach
that diuers traditions of faith and manners
whereof there is no ground nor euidence in
the scripture are to be receaued with equall re-
uerence and respect with the scriptures them-
selues: and that they relie partelie vpon their
owne merites and satisfaction of Saintes for
their saluation and the like: I say if the iudi-
cious and vnpartiall reader duelie ponder all
the particulars, I doubt not but he will easilie
discerne the house of truth and safe way to sal-

uation

nation to be where he findes honestie and plainenes, and in the contrarie the house of falsitie & the by-way where he findes tricks & cousinage. And therfore the more to facilitate & rectifie his iudgment in the busines I will reduce the whole argument of the knightes booke to a forme of sylogisme in this manner.

That Religion is a by-way leading the weake & vnstable into dangerous pathes of error which is founded vppon coulourable shewes of Apochriphall scriptures, vnwriten traditious, doubtfull Fathers ambiguous Councells and pretended Catholique Church.

But the religion of the Church of Rome is founded vppon colourable shewes of apochriphal scriptures, vnwritten traditions, doubtful fathers ambiguous Councels & pretended Catholique Church.

Therfore the relgiō of the Romā Church is a by-way leading the weake & vnstable in to the dangerous pathes of error.

Now, the *minor* of this sylogisme in which the whole force of the conclusion, and by consequence the whole scope and authoritie of the worke depēdes, not onely hauing binne in the discourse of my answere to euerie seuerall section disproued for false & counterfeit, but alsoe more

appeare to be such *ex ipsis terminis* euen of it selfe by the termes & propositions of which it consists, to all such as shall consider it with due attention: I persuade myselfe the iuditious reader will presently perceaue & determine with him selfe that the author of the worke hath quite fayled of his proiect, & that by composing a by path with a sinister intention to father it Falsely vppon his aduersaryes, he hath in stead of that, onely framed an ingen for his owne torment.

And thus hauing attayned not onely to an accomplishment of myne owne desires in finishing my labours, but also in some sorte to a satisfaction of the request of my aduersary in regard that at the least in showe (as I perceaue by the conclusion of his preface) he desireth nothing more then in answere to his booke; I now conuert my speech vnto him & tell him, that as now according to his owne petition I haue impartially read his booke, & clearely & faithfully, yea & as moderately or more moderately then his owne immoderate proceedings require, discouered vnto him not one or two but a multitude of errors, vntruthes, & corruptions, and false applications both of scriptures Councells & particular authors as well ancient as moderne: soe

doe I in contemplation of the ſame expect from him the retractation which he promiſeth vppon condition his faultes be ſhowne vnto him, which if he ſhall accordingly performe I will not onely as he profeſſeth with holy Iob of the anſere of his aduerſary, binde it as a Croune vnto me, but alſoe ſaying with the ſame renowned ſaint, I will read it & pronounce it at euery ſtep I make, yea and offer it to my vnderſtāding as a moſt princely preſent, earneſtly praying in the meane tyme with the ſame Iob, *vt deſiderium meum audiat Omnipotens*. That the omnipotent may heere my deſire of his reclamation & reduction to the moſt vniuerſally floriſhing Catholique Roman faith.

A SVPPLIMENT OF ADDITIONS TO THE APPENDIX.

I Haue alreadie noted diuers moſt foule corruptions and falſifications in Sir Humfrey Iinds pretented ſafe way in ſoe much that I am almoſt quite ſurfeted with the multitude of them, yet in my opinion ther is ſcarce anie amõg all thoſe which comes neare to the falſe dealing and couſinage which the ſame Sir Humfrey vſeth in the 205. page of his *Demia*, which if it were for noe other reaſon, yet for this a lone it might moſt iuſtely deſerue the name, not as it is falſely applyed to the Romaniſts, but as it is his owne proper worke, which if the reader will but pleaſe to haue a little patience, I will plainely ſet before his eyes.

Wherefore Sir Humfrey in the place now cyted vndertaking to proue that trãſſubſtantiation wants antiquitie, vniuerſalitie, and ſucceſſion, hauing firſt cited ſome teſtimonies both out of Greeke and Latin authors (which neuertheleſſe are either of noe force for his purpoſe, or els

haue ben ansered partely by Bellarmin and other Catholique diuines, and partely by my selfe in my Censure he stumbles last vpon the late Patriarch of Cnnstantinople whome he alsoe produceth to the same intent in the 10. and 13. chapters of his first anser to the Germanes, affirming that this author teacheth what is meant by that change or transmutation made in the Sacrament, saying, he tells vs, the bodie and bloud of Christ are truely misteries not that these, *Metaballomena*, are changed in to humane flesh but wee vnto thē: thus Sir Humfrey soe confidently as if he had ben Greeke Professor in Oxford he coud haue done no more. And in deed I must needs confesse that this passage of his is able to make a greate showe especially bringing a Greeke worde in the midest of it.

But now when I came to examen the matter in the booke it selfe and conferred the Greeke and the Latin togither as I founde it printed at witerberg a place voyde of all suscipition on our syde, I found first that the author speakes soe plainely of the reall presence and transsubstantiation, that altho' he vseth not the verie same worde, yet doth he vse other wordes equiualent, as, *conuersion*, *transmutation*, or the lyke, at the least ten or a dozen tymes, o-

nely

nely in those verie chapters. Nay and more then this, I fynde that where he speakes of the conuersion or transmutation he vseth that verie worde *Metapallo*, which the knight denyeth him to vse, where he diuineth the change of the bodie and bloud in to humane flesh, which is a forceble argumẽt a contrario that the Patriarch speakes of a reall change wheresoeuer else in this matter he vseth that worde.

Secondly. I fynde that those wordes which Sir Humfrey cytes are not spoken by the Grecian Patriarke of the proper transmutation in the Sacrament, but of another transmutation which belong onely to the vse of the Sacrament to wit, he saith and that verre truely, that when a faithfull person receiues the Sacrament, the bodie and bloud which he receiues are not changed in to humane flesh, but the receiuers in to them. *Non quod hæc* (saith the Patriarch) *in corpus humanum transmutentur sed nos in illa meliora his prævalentibus*: and here it is that he vseth the worde *Metaballomena* and denyeth it to be verifyed in this kynde of mutation, speaking according to that which an ancient Father of the Church sayth to the same purpose: *Non tu mutaberis in me, sed ego mutabor in te.* That is to saye. *O lord thou shalt not be changed in to mee, but I in to thee.*

thee. Which ſpirituall change or vnion the ſame Patriarch doth learnedly proſecute and declare with examples, not intending by that to exclude the reall preſence of Chriſts bodie & bloude in the Sacramẽt by tranſſubſtantiation (as Sir Humfrey would willingly perſuade his ſimple reader but ſuppoſing and includeing the ſame as in diuers of his paſſages in theſe twoe chapters is moſt apparent, and particularly where he ſayth not farre before, *ac quamdiu panis poſitus iacet, nihil niſi panis eſt repoſitus tantum Deo: poſtea verus panis fit & reuera tranſmutatur, cuius rei ratio & modus nullo ingenio, nullo ore humano explicari poteſt.* And page. 97. *Honorabilia hæc dona in ipſum Dominicum tranſmutantur corpus quod hæc omnia recepit, ſcilicet quod crucifixum ſit, quod reſurrexit, quod in Cælos aſcendit.* The honorable giftes (he meanes the bread and wine) *are changed into the lordes bodie it ſelfe &c.* and in the precedent page, *qui operationis ſanctorum myſteriorum proprium hoc opus ſtatuunt vt dona (intellige panem & vinum) in diuinum Chriſti corpus & ſanguinem, tranſmutentur, in finem hunc vt fideles ſanctificentur, peccatorumque remiſſionem, regni hæreditatem, & id genus alia accipere credant, non tales beatos prædicamus?* Thus the Patriarch ſoe perſpicuouſly that he who either vnderſtades Greeke or Latin

yea

yea or Englisſh either, may euidently ſee that the Patriarch is cited by our aduerſarie euidently againſt himſelfe, and quite contrarie to his true meaning.

Yet was not Sir Humfray content with that, but as a ma runing forwarde in madneſſe to his owne confuſion he cites the ſame author in his former tenth chapter intending to proue out of him that it is not the reall and ſubſtantiall fleſh of Chriſt which is offered but the Sacrament of his fleſh, he tells vs ſayth the knight, that the fleſh of Chriſt which he caried aboute him was not giuen to his Apoſtles to be eaten, nor his bloud to be drunke, neither doth the bodie of our lord deſcend frome heauen for this were blaſphemie, which wordes I confeſſe the Patriarke hath (excepting theſe: *in the Sacrament*: Which are added to the text by Sir Humfrey) but as he hath them ſoe hath he others omitted by our aduerſarie the knight both before and after theſe, which clearely declare his mynde touching the reall preſence. The precedent wordes are theſe: *Dominus enim illa nocte accepit panem gratias egit, fregit, & dixit, accipite & comedite non dixit hoc eſt azimum, aut typus corporis, ſed hoc eſt corpus meum, hic eſt ſanguis meus*; that is our lord that night tooke bread, gaue thankes, brake it, and

ſaid,

ſaid, take and eate. He ſaid not this is vnleauined bread, or this is the figure of my bodie, but this is my bodie, this is my bloud. And then immediately enſue the wordes cited by Sir Humfrey, after which alſoe immediately followes: *Sed & tunc, & nunc inuocatione & gratia omnipotentis illius ſacrorum rituum Antiſtitis Spiritus ſancti, ſacrarum precationum & diuinorum oraculorũ interuentum panis quidem in ipſum Domini corpus, vinum vero in ipſum Domini ſanguinem conuertitur & transmutatur.* But both then and now by inuocation and grace of that omnipotent Prelate of ſacred rities the holie Goſt, by interuention of ſacred prayers, and diuine oracles, the bread truely is conuuerted and changed into Chriſts bodie it ſelfe, but the wine into to his bloud.

In which wordes the learned and prudent reader can not but ſee both the reall preſence and the conuerſion or change of the elements of bread and wine (which is nothing els but tranſſubſtantiation) into the bodie and bloud of Ieſus Chriſt moſt plainely ſpecifyed. Which may abundantly ſerue to demonſtrate the truth of the Patriarkes meaning, and that no man liuing excepting ſuch a lad of mettall as the coragious knight would haue had the face to make vſe or rather

abuſe

abuse of such a testimonie as this, soo quyte opposite to his purpose, especially the second place being taken out of that chapter in which the author him selfe in the begining of the same doth expressely affirme, that ther are manie things maintained by the lutherans in the supper of our lord which displease the Grecians, one of which doubtlesse and not the least, is the point of transsubstantiation which the Lutherans reiected in their remonstrance to the Greeke Church, and Ierimie the Patriarcke maintaines in his answer to the same. To all which may be added yet more expresse wordes of the same Patriarke saying thus. *Statuit igitur Catholica Ecclesia mutari consecratione facta panem quidem in ipsum corpus Christi, vinum vero in ipsum sanguinem eius per spiritum sanctum &c.* The Catholique Church therfore (saith he) defins that the consecration being made the bread is changed into the bodie of Christ but the wine into his bloud by the holie Gost &c. And it is to be noted that he vseth the worde *Metaballomena* in these places in which he speakes of the conuersion or transmutation of the bread and wine into the bodie and bloud of Christ, which doth manifestly de monstrate the Grecian Patriarch to maintaine that same change of the bread and

multa enim de illâ (Cena) audiũtur apud vas quæ nobis displicent. Ierem. Patriarcha

and wine in the consecration of the Eucharist which the Romanists in Latin call transsubstãtiation which is sufficient to cõuince the prepostorousnes of the iniudicious knight in makeing vse of this great Prelate for his owne contrarie position.

Touching inuocation of saincts and their worship Sir Humfrey in the 232. page of his deuious way alledges against the Romanists the confessiõ of the Greeke Church quoting in the margen the same Patriarch of Constantinople and relating his wordes in his anser to the German Doctors cap. 1. Wher according to his relation, the Patriarch sayth in the name of him selfe and fellowes, that they doe not properly inuocate saints but God, for neither Peter nor Paule heare ame of those that inuocate them, but the gift and grace that they haue according to the promisse: I am with you till the consummation of the world. Thus the knight rehearses that authors wordes but yet corruptedly, for first the Patriarch hath not those negatiue wordes: *We doe not properly innocate saints*, but this affirmatiue: *innocation doth proporly agree to God onely*, and it doth agree to him primarily and most immediately (which wordes Sir Humfrey leaueth out) but inuocation made to saints is not properly inuocation but accidentally,

tally, and as if we should say by grace or fauor: which latter words alsoe the knight partely mangled and partely omitted.

Secondly the Patriarch dot not saye Peter and Paule doe not heare their inuocators but he sayth: they doe not *exaudire*, that is they doe not heare and graunt by their owne power the petitions of those that inuocate them. And ther is soe much betwixt *audire & exaudire*, that his hearing and graunting that which is heard, that althou' the one vndoubledly agree to the saints both in the doctrine of the Grecian Church and the Roman: yet of the exaudition or hearing with a graunt, doubt may be made euen according to the doctrine of the Roman Church whether it is proper to saints or noe, in regarde it may be cõceiued that altho' the saints be truely intercessors betweene vs and God, yet haue they not power to graunt our requests but onely to mediate for vs by way of impetration. And therfore the same author saith that Peter and Paule doe not *exaudire* that is, not soe heare vs as they them selues graunt our petition which they heare but κατα χάριν that is according or by the fauor they haue by virtue of the promisse of our Sauior: *I will be with you till the end of the world*, as the Grecian Patriarch doth

sufficiently declare. And that the Grecians doe in generall termes graunt inuocation of saints (which is that which both agrees with the Roman doctrine and differs from the doctrine of the pretented reformers) it is manifest not onely out of this place but alsoe out of other places of the Patriarkes answer, as particularly in the 13. chapter pag 102. wher it is said by him: that in the sacrifice or masse, *mentionem beatissimæ Virginis facimus, laudes eius prædicantes, intercessione sanctorum omnium petentes, misericordiam Dei implorantes pro viuis mortuisque supplicantes &c.* And yet more plainely in the verie 21. chapter cited by our aduersarie, where the Patriarke hath these wordes. *Hæc meditatio nunc in Ecclesia fit & deprædicatur, & ad sanctos exclamamus, & ad dominam nostram & ad sanctos Angelos: & ad dominam quidem nostram, ter sancta domina Deipara pro nobis intercede peccatoribus: ad sanctos autem Angelos, omnes cælestes potestates sanctorum Angelorum, & Archangelorum orate pro nobis &c.* This meditation is now made & preached in the Church: we both crye aloud to the saints and to our ladie, and to the Angels: and to our ladie truly, thrise holie ladie mother of God intercede for vs sinners. But to the holie Angeles all you, Celestial. Powers of holie Angels, and Algels pray for vs &c. Loe heare the verie same forme of

prayer

prayer to saints which the Romanist vse: soe that the reader may easily iudge how preposterously Sir Humfrey hath proceeded in the citation of this auther. And howsoeuer it is that the Grecians will not call this proper inuocation of saints, yet that is but *questio de nomine*, a question onely aboute the name or worde inuocation, which little importes supposing that in reallitie and substance they disegree not from the Romanists, but rather are most conformable vnto them euen in the manner of their interpellation.

And besydes this if wee note the Lutherans wordes to the Patriarke, it will euen thēce manifestly appeare what the Grecians defēd touching his point. For say the Doctors: *Non dubium est quin sit de sanctis reuerenter sentiendum, & loquendum &c. non tamen sentimus eos esse innocandos vt sint nostri mediatores atque intercedant apud Deum pro nobis qui iam mortui sunt.* Which wordes of the Lutherans being those which they directly oppose against the doctrine of the Grecians in this particular, it is clearer then the leight of the sunne that the Grecians agree with vs, and be contrarie to the tenets of Sir Humfrey and other sectaries of our tymes. And thus we see that altho' Sir Hūfrey both in this and diuers other places of his

his bookes doth much labore to perſuade the reader that the Grecian Church agrees with the pretented reformers and differ from vs in doctrine of controuerſie, neuertheleſſe his worke wil not ſadge, it being manifeſt to them whoe haue viewed the doctrine of their Patriarke in his foreſaid anſer to the lutherans, that excepting the point of the Popes ſupremacie (in which neuertheleſſe the Grecians doe not in euerie reſpect agree with them) they doe not fully ioyne with the nouelliſts of our age in anie one of the queſtions in controuerſie betwixt vs and them. And ſoe I may conclude that Sir Humfrey not obſtanding all the fraudes and diuiſes he hath vſed in laboring to make the Grecians ſeeme to ſtand for his faction, he doth but onely raſe duſte to moleſt and daſle his readers eyes.

More ouer the ſame Patriarke page 243. of his anſer to the lutherans doth abſolutely prnounce that ſaints are to be invocated for thus he ſaith. *Ad hæc nos ope diuina reſpondemus inuocandos eſſe ſanctos quod ipſi etiam auxiliari poſſint.* And he addeth after warde. *Nec id faciunt ſolum viui ſed etiam mortui.* And a little lower he ſubioyneth. *Inuocatione ſanctorum dæmones abiguntur, morbi fugantur, tentationes tolluntur &c.* Alſo page 244.

honorandi

honorandi igitur sunt sancti tanquam amici Dei.

In like maner touching the images of Saints he further addeth. *A nobis etiam imaginibus ipsorum reverentiam exhiberi, aut adorari nemo reprehendit &c.* That is, *none of vs reprehendeth that reuerence, or adoration be exhibited to their images.* Meaning of the Saincts: And in the page following he saith in this manner. *At (inquit aliquis) Deus dixit. Deum tuum adorabis & illi soli seruies: & non facies vllam similitudinem.* He answereth thus. *Est vero ita; sunt haec lege divina sancita, verumtamen qui hoc praecipit Deus, idem docet nos in deuteronomio. Non adorabis ipsis, non seruies.* And page 254. Soe he speakes. *Vt igitur qui non honorat filium (vt ait dominus) non honorat patrem: sic qui non honorat imaginem nec illum quem imago refert honorat.* And in the same page. *Qui non adorat Crucem, eum nequidem Dominum crucifixum adorare iustum est. Non quidem certe naturam ligni &c. Sed memoriam & picturam perfessorum &c.*

Finally of merit he saith thus. *Haec & similia sunt ob quae homo regno caelesti dignus habetur.* That is *these & the like ar these thing for which a man is held worthie of the celestiall kingdome,* thus much touching the

abuse of the Grecian Patriarke by Sir Humfrey.

But one of the grosseſt errours that I finde committed by our aduerſarie in the Doctrine of the latiniſts or Romaniſts, is in his page 234. where he hath theſe wordes. Others (as namely Antiſiodorenſis & Biel) teache that neither the Saints pray for vs, neither are we to praye to them. Thus Sir Humfrey, further adding that he may ſafely conclude theſe and the like reaſons conſidered that inuocation of Saints wants antiquitie, vniuerſalitie, & ſucceſſion.

And yet I hauing examined the matter & taken a viewe of the 30. Lection of Gabriel Biel which is the place the knight cites for his hallucination, I finde that author expreſſely teacheth the affirmatiues of both thoſe negatiues which he falſely affirmes him and Antiſiodore to maintaine.

Wherfore touching the firſt propoſition, Biel in the place cited hath theſe wordes for his concluſion. *Credendum eſt igitur & nullatenus dubitandum ſanctos in patria intercedere nobiſque ſuffragari merito, ac precè, ſiue voto.* And for proofe of the ſame he addeth thus. *Quæ veritas authoritate oſtenditur & ratione, authoritate vtriuſque teſtamenti veteris & noui ſimul, & ſanctorum Patrum.* And before

fore his conclusion he saith: *fuit hæresis quorundam, nimia temeritate omnem sanctorū cultum penitus tollere volentium qui nullum sanctis honorem impendi debere mussitabant, neque vllas ad eos preces dirigi, nec eorum reliquias venerari. Huius author & hæresiarcha primus fuit Iouinianus &c.* Which wordes although they doe sufficiently declare what this author holdes of the second parte of this point, yet doth he more expressely vtter the same towardes the end of this lection saying: *ex quibus patet preces nostras spemque consequendæ beatitudinis per mediatores sanctos in Cælo manes non esse sed ordine a Deo instituto nos ad eorum auxilia confugere debere & debita veneratione eos semper implorare.* By all which wordes Biels doctrine is soe plaine for the Romanists, & soe plaine againſt Sir Humfrey that I am verily perſuaded he either neuer read this author touching this particular, or if he read him, he did not vnderstand him.

And the like I say of Antisiodore whoe being in the same place cited, I fynd that he himselfe teacheth quite contrarie to that which the knight chargeth him with. For wheras he is alledgeth by Sir Hũfrey in the 4. parte of his summe lib. 3. q. 6. to resolue that neither the saints doe praye for vs, neither are wee to praye to them: it is true Antisiodore relates the opinion of manie whoe

ſay that neither are wee to praye to the ſaints nor they praye for vs but onely improperly, to wit becauſe we pray God that the merits of his ſaincts may helpe vs, whéce it is conſequent that their merits may helpe vs: Neuertheleſſe for his owne reſolution of the queſtion he puts the contrarie propoſition ſaying, *Concedimus quod oramus Sanctos proprie, & ipſi orant pro nobis proprie, vt cum dicimus ſancte Petre ora pro nobis, &c.*

Wee graunt ſaith Antiſiodore *that wee praye to the ſaincts properly, & that they pray for vs properly as when we ſay: Saincte Peter pray for vs.* And now loe here how faithleſſely the knight hath proceeded in his allegation of the teſtimonies of theſe twoe authors, whoe both ſoe plainely conſpire againſt him: & let the reader alſoe conſider how little reaſon our aduerſarie had to conclude that inuocation of ſaincts hath neither antiquitie, vniuerſalitie nor ſucceſſion, ſuppoſing that he can conclude no other ſafetie out of theſe and the like premiſſes then ſuch as proceeds frome his owne forgerie & deceite.

And altho' Gabriel cites an opinion of manie others that graunt the Saints doe praye onely improperly for vs by mediation of their merits, yet doe they not exclude all prayer to ſaincts, as Sir Humfrey

and

& the reſt of his pretenſiue reformed bro-
thers doe, whoe if they would but graunt
the ſame, the Roman Church would not
ſoe much complaine of them; neither is
the difference of thoſe Romaniſts frome
others in the ſubſtance of this queſtion in
controuerſie, which is whether the ſaincts
intercede & praye for faithfull Chriſtians
liuing in this world, & whether we may
praye vnto them & inuocate them, in both
which partes of doctrine all Romaniſts
agree, but theſe diuines mentioned by Biel
doe diſſent from the reſt onely aboute the
maner of interceſſion which ſaints doe vſe
making a queſtion whether they performe
that charitable acte by formall prayer ma-
de vnto God for vs or by interpoſition of
their merits by that meanes to moue his di-
uine maieſtie to graunt our requeſts, which
manner of mediation as it is not the cheefe
queſtion betwixt our aduerſarie of theſe ty-
mes & vs, ſoe neither is it an argument of
defect of antiquitie', vniuerſalitie, or ſuc-
ceſſion in the Roman doctrine, nor anie
proofe of the ſame notes to concurre in the
tenets of the moderne ſectaries as Sir Hum-
frey doth falſely ſuppoſe & proueth not,
but onely equiuocateth in the ſtate of the
queſtion, or rather by affected ignorance

transuerſteth the meaning of the foreſaid diuines touching this point taking the maner for the ſubſtance of the matter, & ſoe either throu' affected ignorance or plaine malice diludes his reader. To let paſſe that altho' the foreſaid authors doe not graunte that the ſaints vſe anie formall or proper forme of prayer to God for vs, yet doe they not deuie our inuocation vnto them. Nay ſuppoſing theſe diuines of whoſe doctrine the kinght would faine take hould as if it were contrarie to the vniuerſalitie of the Roman faith: ſuppoſing I ſay as Sir Humfrey him ſelfe relates out of Gabriel they defend the mediation of ſaints by their merits at the leaſt, if he had had is ſenſes in readineſſe, he might eaſily haue either inferred that thoſe ſame authors in like máner hould that we may inuocate & pray vnto them euen peoperly & formally: or at the leaſt it is plaine he neither ought nor could deduce the non inuocation of ſaints frome the foreſaid mediation, as erroneouſly he doth, & conſequently he greatly abuſeth the maintainers of that opinion in that he produceth them againſt the vniuerſalitie, antiquitie, and continuall ſucceſſion of the Roman doctrine in this particular, ſeeing they differ not a iot frome other Catholique diuines in it touching the ſubſtan-

ce

ce of faith: yea they are soe farre from this, that they expressely consent with them both in the doctrine of mediation & merits, both which points neuertheless the Nouellists doe obstinately impugne, soe that it appeareth as a manifest trueth that Sir Humfrey can not possible with all his arte & deuises scrape anie thing out of them for the antiquitie, vniuersalitie, & succession of his pretensiue reformed congregation, but rather that which doth quite destroye it if he had his dyes aboute him to perceiue it.

To the wordes cited by Sir Humfrey page 263. concerning images, Biel subioyneth these. *Nec tamen propter hæc imagines proijciendæ sunt aut de oratorijs eliminandæ occasione idololatriæ deuitandæ, aut peregrinationes ad certas imagines vel certa loca præsertim consecrata vel etiam consecranda penitus reprehendenda, non enim vsque quaque negandũ est quin in certis locis singulariter reluceant beneficia & maiora crebrius quam in alijs vel propter imagines sanctorum, reliquias ibi conditas, vel occulta ministeria (alias mysteria) futuris temporibus ibi celebranda aut celebrata vel alias causas nobis occultas propter quas Deus vnum locum elegit suo cultui, non alium,*

Thus much Biel in can. missæ lec. 49. Which wordes neuertheless are slylie o-

mitted by Sir Humfrey, & his freind Caſſander, which other wiſe are ſoe plaine for the Catholique practice in this matter enen at this day, that they confounde them both. And this is their falſe plot which they vſed to make this moſt Catholique author ſeeme to fauore their ill cauſe, wheras in reallitie he is plainely againſt them.

Page 152. of the by-way, Canus is cited by Sir Humfrey lib. 3. cap. 3. And falſely alledged as if he gaue a reaſon wherfore *traditions are aboue ſcriptures*. For he onely affirmes that they are of greater force to conuince hæretikes then ſcriptures, that which in ſubſtance was taught long ſince by ancient Tertullian & is no blemiſh vnto the written worde of God, which in other reſpects both the ſame Canus & all other Romaniſts at the leaſt equalize yea prefer before the vnwritten doctrine of the Church in generall.

In his citation of Canus page 399. of his by way, Sir Humfrey puts the obiection as if it were the doctrine of the author whoe propoundeth & anſereth the ſame in his laſt chapter of the firſt booke, ſharpely reprehending Pighius out of whoſe opinion the obiection is framed by Canus & reproued. Altho' he inſinuates with all that the error of Pighius.

Is

Is not in matter of faith & doctrine ne-
ceſſatie to ſaluation, which is that onely
which Canus profeſſeth to maintaine in
the defenſe of the authoritie of Councels,
Nos enim in dogmate fidei & decretis ad ſalutem
fidelium neceſſarijs Conciliorum authoritatem aſ-
ſerimus: in rerum geſtarum iudicio & ordine non
aſſerimus. Canus de locis lib. 5. cap. vlt. ad ſep. ar-
gumentum.

When Coſterus pag. 44. of his Enchir.
prefers traditions before the word of God:
he takes tradition as it is writen in carnall
tables of the harte by the finger of the holy
ſpirit: & on the contrarie he takes the writ-
ten worde of God preciſely as it conſiſts in
letters & caracters which may periſh or be
corrupted by the falſe conſtruction of he-
retikes, or otherwiſe. And therfore Coſte-
rus calles the firſt internall, the ſecõd exter-
nall ſcriptures in the margen of the ſame
page 44.

And when the ſame coſterus citcd by Sir
Humfrey page. 149. of his *Denia*, in the firſt
chapter of his Euchyr. ſaith theſe wordes.
præſtantia huius ſcripturæ &c. the excellen-
cie of this ſcripture doth ſurpaſſe the ſcrip-
tures *multis partibus*, in manie reſpects or by
manie degrees thoſe ſcriptures which the
Apoſtles left vs in partchement, he doth
not ſpeake of the vnwritten tradition of

the

the Church, but of that ſcripture which (as afterwardes he declareth) *Spiritus ſanctus in cordibus imprimere dignatus eſt*, that is which the holie ſpirit doth digne or voutſafe to imprinte in our hartes. Which as he ſpeakes before in the ſame chapter, is nothing els but the ſpirit of conſent of the Catholike Church in faith, and the concording doctrine of all faithfull Chriſtians, not of thoſe onely which now liue in the whole world, but thoſe alſoe whoe by continuall ſucceſſion haue propagated the faith of Chriſt from the tyme of the Apoſtles which is that Scripture which the Apoſtle ſaith 2. cor. 3. is read by all men, and the vnction. *quæſt. 2. Io. 2. docet nos de omnibus &c. which teaches vs all things*, which as he further addeth afterwardes hath all truth in it ſelfe and containeth all faith and myſteries of Chriſtian religion, and reſolues all doubtes which may aryſe in matter of faith, and ſoe coſterus compareth not the vnwritten worde with the written preciſely but the internall with the externall, which internall ſcripture is iuſtely preferred by him before the bare written worde or caracter, becauſe as he takes it here it includes the true ſenſe of both the one and the other: by which it appeares that the exceptions which Sir Humfrey takes at

this

this authors wordes ar captious and voyde of reason.

Vrspergensis is produced by Sir Humfrey page 400. of his deuia as a witnesse that the second councel of Nyce or seuēth generall synod assembled in the yeare 788. was reiected in the councell of Francford as vterly voyde and not to be named the seuenth. And yet hauing examined this passage in that author, I synde he speakes not a worde of the Nycene councell but of a certaine councell of Constantinople which he affirmes to haue ben called the seuenth synod general by the Emperatrice Irene and her sonne Constantine: his wordes are these. *Sinodus etiam qua ante paucos annos in Constantinopoli congregata sub Irene & Constantino filio eius septima & vniuersalis ab ipsis appellata est, vt nec septima nec aliquid diceretur quasi spernenda ab omnibus (nimirum patribus Concilij Francfordiensis) abdicata est.* Vrsperg. pag. 176. in which wordes of what soeuer Councell vrpergensis intended to speake, yet none of them mention the Councell of Nyce as all those whoe vnderstand latin may easily perceiue. And if Sir Hunfrey will replye and say that tho' that author doth not mention the Nycene Councell in wordes, yet doth he sufficiently declare his meaning to be of no other

Coun-

Councell then the seeond Nycene Synod in regarde he affirmes it to haue ben vnder Irenne and her sonne, and the same which was condemned in the Councell of Francford, I anser that by reason this author doth vtter twoe things which seeme to implye contradictiõ to wit that this Councell was assembled at Constantinople and yet that it is the same which was reiected by the Councell of Francford, it euidently followeth that no certaine argument can be drawne frõ his wordes what soeuer his meaning was, and this is sufficient to shewe that he is cited in vaine by the knight.

Secondly I say not obstanding vspergensis hallucination, and suppose he did truely meane that the Councell of Nyce concerning the adoration of images was reproued by the Synod of Francford, as some other authors admit in their disputatiõs with the sectaries of our tymes, yet doth this nothing auaile our aduersaries cause both in respect the Synod of Francford is not accepted by the Romanists for an authenticall Councell in this particular, as also for that (as some opinate) it proceeded vpon false information, and persuasion that the foresaid Synod of Nyce had decreed that images were to be adored with diuine honor, and by this meanes the Fathers and doctors

ctors ther assembled were deceiued and committed an error of fact. Which error neuertheleſſe neither can nor ought to preiudice that doctrine which was before eſtabliſhed by an authenticall generall Councell as was the secõd Synod consisting of a happie cõiunction of both the latin & Grecian Church as of sune and moone. And the reader may see that Sir Humfrey hath both dealt some thing insincere in the allegatiõ of Vspergensis, and also hath proceeded prepoſterously in that he indeuored to infringe the authoritie of the greater Councell by the vncertaine proceeding of the leſſe.

Page 261. of the same *dem.* he detortes the S. Irenæus wordes contrarie to his meaning against Apoſtolicall traditions. And yet S. Irenæus euen in the wordes which are cited by him, speakes onely against thoſe who denyed absolutely that the trueth is deliuered by the Scriptures but onely by tradition, and soe made themselues or their owne traditions the rule of faith. Of which number of hererikes saith he were Valentinus Marcion, Cerinthus, Baſilides, of whome he vttered the wordes cited by Sir Humfrey, as affirming that the truth could not be founde by Scriptures by thoſe who e were ignorant of traditions for say they: the

truth

truth was not deliuered by writing but by worde of mouth, yet notobstanding this the same Irenæus afterwardes speakes against others whoe doe not denye scriptures, or rather against such as follow scriptures onely and reiect traditions receiued from the Apostles by succession of preists and conserued or obserued in the Church saying that they haue founde the pure truth. (as the pretended reformers nowe commonly babble) of whome he saith that *They neither consent to scriptures nor traditions, and against whome* (saith the saint) *we ought euerie way to resist.* Soe that it is cleare that he disputes here onely against such heretikes as neither yeilde to scriptures nor traditions, and therfore he putteth for the title of his chapter in this place *quod neque scripturis neque traditionibus obsequantur haretici:* that heretiques neither obey scriptures nor traditions: both which S. Irenæus doth expressely imbrace.

And by this let the reader iudge how impertinently the knigh doth produce this testimonie against those (I meane the Romanists) who neither reiect the scriptures nor approued traditions but like twoe indiuided companions receiue them both: and let him alsoe consider whether the doctrine of holye Irenæus in this place be not farre more

more contrarie to the tenet of the preteded reformers then to the doctrine of the Roman Church: whoe make onely scriptures expounded according to their owne sense the sole rule of faith. Especially considering that the same ancient Father in the next ensuing chapter doth expressely receiue Apostolicall traditions saying in the verie first wordes: *traditionem itaque Apostolicam in toto mundo manifestam in Ecclesia adest perspicere omnibus qui vera volunt audire, & habemus annumerare eos qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesijs & successores eorum vsque ad nos qui nihil tale docuerunt neque cognouerunt quale ab his deliratur.* By which wordes it is manifest that S. Irenæus doth confute his aduersaries the heretikes not by scripture onely, but also & cheefely by traditionarie authoritie of the Bishops succeeding frome the Apostles: which is directly opposite to the tenets especially of the purer sorte of nouellists whoe neither admitte traditions nor Episcopall authoritie but the onely written worde for absolute and sole Iudge of all Controuersies & confutation of heresies.

Caietan in his Commentarie vpon the historian bookes of the old Testament (as I am persuaded) doth not plainely affirme (neither doth Canus charge him with that

error)

that the bookes of Machabies are not absolutely Canonicall, as Sir Humfrey alledgeth but he onely reprehendeth him for vsing a vaine distinction of Canonicall scriptures as if there were some Canonicall onely for instruction of manners and not for matters of faith: against the infirmitie or vnsoundnesse of which distinction Canus vseth this reprehensiue conclusion saying. *Cum sub eodem contextu omnes illi libri nullo facto discrimine definiantur esse Canonici* (scilicet Ecclesiasticus. Sapientia. Tobias, Iudith, Machabæorũ libri duo, & Baruch) *ridiculum est vt partim in una significatione partim in alia libros Canonicos habeamus. Ac si hãc semel distinctionem admittimus authoritate Conciliorum atque Pontificum nullus liber Sacer constare poterit.*

And presently after. *Id quoniam absurdum omnino est, retineamus totum eam rationem oportet quam Caietanus voluit evertere vir (vt sepe iam dixi) cum primis eruditus & pius, sed qui in libris Canonicis constituendis Erasmi monitates ingeniumque secutus, dum alienis vestigijs voluit insistere propriam gloriam maculauit.* And soe you see Canus doth not confesse that directly Caietan maintained the Machabies not to be Canonicall but onely with that distinction: neither did in deed Caietan more denye the authoritie of those bookes then

he

he did the Epistle to the Hæbrewes; & that of S. Iames which neuertheleſſe he held absolutely for Canonicall tho' not perhaps in the ſame rigorous ſenſe in which he iudged all the reſt of the bookes of ſcripture to be in the Canon, by reaſon thoſe, as alſoe ſome other partes of ſcripture, haue ben by ſome ancient authors doubted of, in which doubt onely he ſeemeth to founde his diſtinction.

Touching the Canonicall bookes of the olde Teſtament Sir Humfrey doth moſt falſely alledge the authoritie of S. Iſidore perſuading his reader that he reiecteth thoſe ſame bookes which he and his companions in the newe religion condemne for Apochripha. Weras in deed that ancient author numbereth them all in the Chriſtiã Canon. And to the end the knights impudencie may more plainely appeare I will rehearſe S. Iſidores expreſſe wordes concerning the ſame whoe in his 6. booke of origenes or etymologies ſaith thus. *Quartus eſt apud nos ordo veteris Teſtamenti eorum librorum qui in Canone Hæbreo non ſunt: quorum primus ſapientiæ liber eſt. Secundus Eccleſiaſticus. Tertius Tobias. Quartus Iudith. Quintus & Sextus Machabæorum.* Quos licet Hæbræi inter Apochrypha ſeparent, *Eccleſia tamen Chriſti inter diuinos libros & honorat & prædicat.* By which

wordes it is soe euident that this holie Father standes for the Romanists and against the pretensiue reformers in this point, that I much maruell how Sir Humfrey could haue the face to produce him in fauor of his cause. Nay more then this out of the distinction which he maketh betweene the the Hebrewes & vs Christians in receiuing the foresaid bookes for Canonicall, I frame a firme coniecture that either all or most of these ancient authors whoe seeme to exexclude them out of the Canon, doe onely intend to declare that they were not included in it by the Iewes as S. Hilarie. S. Hierome, & S. Epiphanius &other authors: concerning which point the reader may please to reade the same S. Isidore *in lib. Proœmiorum de libris veteris & noui Testamenti.*

In the 431. page of his by-way the kinght abuseth Canus whome he there citeslib. 12. cap. 13. For he foysteth in by a parenthesis of his owne the worde *reall* which neither Canus hath, nor yet putteth the force of his reprehension *of the bishop of Bitont* in that he affirmed in the Councell of Trent that Christ did not offer his reall bodie in his last supper, but because he affirmed that Christ did not offer his owne bodie absolutely, abstracting frō reall or not reall, the question not being in

that

that passage of the reall presence, but of the Sacrifice of Christs bodie & bloud in the Eucharist, which as it seemes by Canus relation the foresaid Bishop in the discussion of this point by way of proposition was of that priuate dictamen, how beit after wardes he willingly conformed him selfe to the rest of the Fathers & to the decree of the Councell. By which it is plaine that this Bishop was not of anie firme & setled opinion which might fauor Sir Humfreys doctrine in that particular. *Illud primum animaduerto iure Cornelium Episcopum Bitontinum in Concilio apud Tridentinum à Patribus & Theologis vniuersis explosum qui dixerit Christum in Cœna non suum corpus & sanguinem obtuliſſe.* And soe you see this is one of Sir Humfreyes prittie pettie trickes which omong other greater will serue to repleniſh his pages. *Canus loco citato.*

The kinght alsoe in his 157. page of his *detta* corrupteth the same author cited in his third booke & third chapter. Where for these wordes, *in sacrificio Eucharistiæ simul cum corpore sanguinem sacerdotibus esse conficiendum, & sumendum &c. Sacræ litteræ nusquam forte tradiderunt*: he translates, *the consecrating & receiuing of the bodie, & bloud of Christ by the preist &c. Are nowhere happily to be found in scripture.* In which pas-

ſage the attentiue reader may eaſily ſee that the knight plaieth the iugler moſt nimbleley. For wheras Canus putteth the force of his ſentence in the wordes *ſimul* together, or at once, & in the other worde *ſumendum*, making an hipotheticall propoſition of all his wordes ioyned togither: our craftie Circulator ſoe hãdleth the matter that his reader may imagin that Canus affirmed that the conſecration of the Euchariſt according to the cuſtome of the Roman Church is not found in the bible. That which that author neuer dreamed, but onely intended to produce as an inſtance of Apoſtolicall traditions that copulatiue of the practice of the preiſts conſecrating & actuall receiuing both the bodie & bloud at one & the ſame tyme in the vſe of the Euchariſt, which Canus ſuppoſeth rather to be a tradition then expreſſely contained in the text of ſcripture.

More ouer Sir Humfrey cites Gretzerus but onely twiſe: firſt in his defenſe of the tenth chapter of the third booke of Bellarmin *de verbo Dei pag.* 15. And of his owne by way page 503. And ſecondly in the ſame Gretzers defenſe of the firſt chapter of the firſt booke of Bellarmine *verbo Dei.*

In the firſt place he abuſeth that author in that he produceth him to proue that the

Church

Church is finally resolued in to the Pope as head & bodie of the same. And yet in the verie same chapter page 1456. & next leafe Gretzer plainely teacheth that our faith is lastely resolued in to diuine reuelatiõ, or in to God reueiling or that which is the same in to the prime veritie in which our faith is founded. His wordes are these in latin. *Nam fides nostra vltima resolvitur in revelationem diuinam seu in Deum revelantem seu quod idem est in primam veritatem qua & nititur fides nostra tanquam fundamento primario tametsi non inficior fidem quoque resolui in Ecclesiam seu Ecclesiæ propositionem, altho I doe not denye that faith is resolued in to the Church, or the proposition of the Church &c.* Immediately after this he saith. *Sed hæc resolutio non est omnino vltima & in principium plane substantiale & essentiale: sed tantum vt in fundamentum secundarium seu vt in conditionem sine qua fides neque recipitur neque retinetur.* And euen in these wordes by the knight, the Pope alone is not put by Gretzerus for the whole Church, but he doth onely say, he denyeth not that the Romanists vnderstand by the Pope the Church in one acception, not absolutely. Which is manifest out of his wordes in the precedent page where he saith: *Intelligimus etiam nomine Ecclesiæ Pontificem pro tempore viuentem quod ipse*

congregare & conuocare potest Concilium, & hinc summi Pastoris & aliorum Præsulum cœtum dicimus esse immediatum & ordinarium & visibilem omnium Controuersiarum quæ de religione existunt Iudicem. By which wordes it is apparent that Gretzerus doth not take the Popes person alone for the head & bodie of the Church, but for the head of the bodie of the Church. How be it I doe not denye but that the Pope as head & cheefe parte of the whole Church may by a senecdoche be taken for the whole Church as he is accepted both by Gretzer and other diuines, but yet this acception will nothing profit Sir Humfrey whose wise designe in this place is to persuade his simple reader that the Romanists take the Pope alone without a generall Councell truely and properly for the whole Roman & Catholique Church which is his owne phantasticall dreame, not our doctrine.

In the other place Sir Humfrey plainely falsifyeth this author, for whereas Gretzerus onely reargueth his aduersaries whoe falsely affirmes that what soeuer the deuill suggesteth to this or that Pope in particular euen against manifest scripture, the Romanists receiue it for Gods worde, saying, that these things be *crepitacula vngantium Prædicantium*, the clappers of prating preachers

chers, & that in truth wee Romanists onely receiue & reuerence for the worde of God that which the cheefe Bishop doth by Cathedrall definition propose vnto vs as the supreme master & Iudge of controuersies. Sir Humfrey by fraudulent displaceing of the worde *onely* & putting it before *the worde of God*, quyte peruertes the sense making his reader beleaue that Gretzer affirmes, that onely to be the worde of God which the Pope proposeth, and as if they held not the scripture it selfe to be Gods worde, the contrarie of which neuertheless the Iesuit deliuers immediately before in expresse termes saying that, it (meaning the scripture) is had & reuerenced by the Pontificians for the worde of God which is soe well knowne that the impudencie of the Predicants can not denye it. And thus much touching the corruption & abuse of Gretzere by the calumnious knight.

Moreouer whereas Sir Humfrey cites Castro in his 12. booke as affirming the deny all of Purgatorie to be a most notorious & knowne error of the Grecias & Armenias, that author is abused by him, for he meanes onely of the moderne Grecians not of the ancient Grecian Fathers, as the knight giues his reader to vnderstand, falsely applying Canus wordes page 181. to the Greek

Church of the first ages, soe that here is plaine forgerie.

In like fashion in his 536. page of the *Defia*, he falsifyes the same author lib. 1. cap. 9. For where Castro saith: *quamuis enim teneamur ex fide credere verum Petri successorem esse supremum totius Ecclesiæ pastorem*, for those wordes *quamuis teneamur* that is, *altho' we are bound*, Sir Humfrey translates, admit we are bounde to beleeue that point, as if Castro had doubted of it, of which neuertheless he makes not anie question, but onely saith, men are not obledged to beleeue by faith that this or that particular person is true Pope. Neither yet doth he denye that euerie Pope hath infallibilitie in a reight line of succession frō S. Peter as the knight doth falsely taxe him: but he affirmes onely that it is not a matter of faith soe to beleeue of euerie Pope in particular. And therfore he addeth that althoe he were not to be accounted an heretike that should denye obedience vnto this or that particular Pope, to wit Clemēt or Leo, yet should he not for doubt of his election sustract him selfe from his obedience. And soe we see that here is no other argument then of want of honest dealing in our aduersarie.

And yet in his 21. section of the *demis* page 551. he traduceth the same Alfonsus

as

as if he had ſcoffed at the Dominicans in generall for that thay were wonte to brag before the people, that he that hath once receiued their habit can not erre or fayle in fairh. Wher it is true that Caſtro reprehends ſharpely, & not without reason, ſome particular religious men that vſed ſuch ſpeeches, but he is ſoe farre from ſaying they are Dominicans, that he expreſely addes that leaſt he ſhould ſeeme to taxe the whole order he purpoſely conceiled the name. *Ne hoc toti ordini ac ſocietati impreſſiſſe videar nomen ordinis ex induſtria ſubticui:* & this he did of Charitie. But Sir Humfrey contrarily is ſoe farre from the exerciſe of that great virtue that he will needs make Caſtro to impoſe that vpon a whole order which he meant onely of ſome particular perſon of perſons. Which is a trick of a iuggler thou' a verie pore one. Neither can I conceiue, except it were by reuelation, howe Sir Humfrey came to know that Caſtro ſpake of the Dominicans more then of anie other religious order, but let that paſſe for one of his great miracles.

Touching the mariage of prieſts caſſander is corrupted by Sir Hũfrey in the 23 art. of his conſult. p. 990. where for *antiquæ conſuetudinis immutandæ*, he puteth in Engliſh, *the change of the lawe*, and ſoe leauing out the

worde *ancient* as alsoe the wordes *prisci moris*, which signifyes the custome of celibate to haue ben no newe lawe as he would falsely persuade his reader, but established in ancient tymes. And more then this he foysteth in to his translation the worde *necessarie* in steed of *flagitare videntur*, And thus like a bungling botcher he patcheth togither those vncertainties of Cassander to make himselfe and others a deceitfull safegarde of greater comfort and benefit for the soule which he erroneously supposeth rather to be in his misreformed faith then in the Romish. And now how vnfaithfull, weake, & pore proceeding of Sir Humfrey this appeares to be, let the indicious reader consider.

The knigh moreouer traduceth Bellarmin in the preface to his booke de Romano Pont. translating in euerie place for *Graeci*, *the Greeke Fathers*, as if the Cardinall did confesse that the ancient and most famous Greeke Fathers to wit S. Chrysostome, S. Basil Epiphanius and others did impugne and resiste the supremacie of the Bishop of Romane. Wheras it is plaine Bellarmin meaneth onely such Grecians as sate in the Councell of Calcedon who fraudulently defined in absence of the Popes legates, that the Patriarch of Constantinople is

foe the second after the Roman Bishop as that yet he hath equall priuiledges, whence Sir Humfrey will needs inferre that the supremacie of the Pope wantes succession: as if the Popes resistance to this attempte of vsurpation in those Grecians were sufficient to extingnish a true and estblished succession of all former tymes.

In his page 104. of the deuia touching Salmeron the knight falsely affirmes out of charnier that he speakes in the person of the Grecians when he vttereth those wordes. *For as much as the benediction of the lord is not superfluous &c.* For Salmeron neither mentions Grecians nor Latinists but onely argues for the second opinion which he putteth of those which seeme to hould that Christ did not consecrate his bodie and bloud with those wordes. *This is my bodie.* But whose soeuer those wordes bee the matter is not great, yet certaine it is that Sir Humfrey dealeth falsely and deceitfully in that he produceth them and Salmeron to proue that the grand point of transubstantiation (as he pleaseth to terme it) hath neither foundation in the scriptures, nor certaintie in the Fathers, nor vnitie among the Romanists whenas neither those wordes of Salmeron are spoken to proue that the grand point of transubstantiation

tiation (as he pleaſeth to terme it) hath neither foundation in the ſcriptures, nor certaintie in the Fathers, nor vnitie among the Romaniſts. When as neither thoſe wordes of Salmeron are ſpoken to anie other end but onely to confirme the opinion of ſuch as hould that our Sauior did not conſecrate with thoſe wordes: *This is my bodie*. Howbeit, both he and they agree moſt vniformely in that how ſoeuer Chriſt him ſelfe did whoſe power being infinite was not tyed to anie wordes at all for the effecting that which he intended no more then he was in the operation of miracles & particularly in the miraculous tranſſubſtantiation of water in to wine in the mariage feaſt of Cana: yet Preiſts whoe are but his ſubſtitutes or inſtruments in that ſacred action doe vndoubtedly conſecrate with thoſe determinate wordes: *This is my bodie*, in which all Romaniſts yea & Grecians (excepting ſome moderne Grecians whoe adde ſome other deprecatorie wordes) doe conſent & vnanimouſly accorde. Wher vpon Salmeron before he comes to rehearſe opinions touching that point whether Chriſt him ſelfe did conſecrate with theſe formall wordes, ſaith plainely. *Illud igitur tanquam certum & conſtitutum eſt apud omnes hanc fuiſſe nobis formam conſecra-*

ſecra-

secrationis præscriptam, & iure diuino institutam ac nobis traditam. Which wordes sufficiently declare that there is no incertaintie among the Romanists aboute the foresaid wordes of consecration: Nay & if ther were that incertaintié among diuines aboute the forme of the Eucharist which Sir Humfrey pretendeth, yet doth it not follow that the Doctrine of transsubstantiation is vncertaine supposing that both Salmerō & all the same diuines agree that the bread and wine are truely transsubstantiated or turned in to the bodie & bloud of Christ, & consequently this author is impertinently alledged as hauing nothing for the knights purpose. Besydes that parte of the wordes which he cites out of Salmeron whether they be the Grecians or not, they include clearely the doctrine of transsubstantiation, to wit those in particular, *when he graue it transmutation was alreadie made*: & soe the vnwarie knight hath alledge this passage against him selfe. For if the change of the bread & wine was made before Christ gaue the Sacrament to his disciples, the Romanists haue their desire & intent, that Christ did truely transsubstantiate the elements, it importing little to this question by what meanes he performed his action.

Page 547. of his *denia* the kinght corrupts Salmeron by a mangled relation & falſe conſtruction of his wordes which he produceth to proue that ſome Romaniſts & particularly Salmeron hould the Popes iudgement infallible. But how ſoeuer it be that ſome Roman diuines hould the Popes authoritie euen without a generall Councell infallible in determining controuerſies in matters of faith, & others the contrarie which as Bellarmin noteth is no matter of faith. Yet certaine it is that Salmeron is here abuſed by Sir Humfrey for that in this place cited (what ſoeuer he doth in others) he rather attributes all infallibilitie in reſoluing & declaring matters of controuerſie, cheefely to the aſſiſtance & power of the holy ſpirit, then either to the Pope or Church. His wordes are theſe. *Neque hæc ſunt ſatis niſi accedat unctio & eruditio Spiritus Sancti quem Dominus manſurum nobiſcum in æternum, qui & in generalibus ſynodis, & in Chriſti Vicario & Petri ſucceſſore reſidens omnes incidentes quæſtiones & ortas de fide controuerſias ſua authoritate terminet atque abſoluat.* Thus Salmeron *prologom. 9. can. 1.* Wher the reader may perceiue that the kinght hath either ignorantly or malitiouſly applyed the relatiue *qui* to the Pope, which neuerthe leſſe is referred by Salmeron to the ho-

ly

ly Goſt. As anie Grammer boy that vnderſtands latin, may eaſſely perceiue. And yet blinde Sir Humfrey whoe not being yet a perfect Gramarian, will needs playe the Doctor of diuinite, engliſheth & rehearſeth Salmerons wordes thus. *The lorde promiſed his Spirit to Chriſts Vicar & the ſucceſſor of Peter & by his authoritie the determins all matters of faith.* Let the reader compare the engliſh with the latin & he will preſently diſcouer the fraud.

S. Iſidor Peluſiota writ the Epiſtle cited by Sir Humfrey page 630. to a monke named Zenon, complaining vnto him of want of virtue & corruption of maners in the Chnrch in compariſon of the primatiue tymes, all which that holy man affirmes to proceed from diſſention & wickedneſſe or malice of theſe whoe gouerne eſpecially of preiſts thou' not of all: but he hath not a worde of the Pope, or of anie defect, or of the latencie or inuiſibilitie of the Church which our aduerſarie profeſſeth to proſecute in that his ſection.

And this which I ſay is made plaine by the laſt clauſe or concluſion of the epiſtle which is this. *At tu ò conſpicue Eccleſiæ alumne ne ad eos qui naufragio pereunt animum attendas nec cum ſegnibus & ignauis teipſum compares: verum ſcientiæ lumen ſplendidius, ſubinde*

redde

redde per vitæ probitatem ac virtutem ipsum irrigans. Atque sponsum expectans ingressum quidem cum ijs qui animis & corporibus virgines sunt. De ijs autem qui virginitatis & sacerdotis dignitati per flagitia sua contumeliam intulerunt, supplicium sumptuum. By which wordes it is plaine here is nothing of anie reformatiõ in Faith made or yet desired in those dayes which is that Sir Humfrey aymeth at. Nor is ther anie worde which fauors luthers pretẽded reformation of the Church. Neuertheleſſe if Sir Humfrey and his consociates could but pick vs out one halfe dozen of ſuch chaſte and religious monkes as theſe, out of all the ſeuerall Congregatiõs of their illuminate brothers ſince the dayes of Luther, then would we moſt willingly giue licence vnto them to reforme the Church at their pleaſures.

Sir Humfrey in the 24. chapter of his *denia* cites a great number of Romaniſts with intention to proue the inuiſibilitie of the Church: & the *medium* he vſeth for his proofe be the teſtimonies of thoſe authors whoe acknowledge abuſes to haue ben in the Church in their ſeuerall ages euen till the dayes of luther: & whoe ſignifye in their writings that they haue deſired reformation of ſuch abuſes. Out of which hol-

holting premisses Sir Humfrey inferreth this crooked conclusion to wit that Luther was the man that made the soe long wished reformation. Which illation as the reader may easily perceiue is as lame as her parēts, neithet is that consequens anie more necessarie then that Mahomet was the reformer of the Church because at the same tyme and before he founded his sect ther were perhaps some things which wanted amēdment. And yet much lesse can anie man imagin how out of those twoe propositions viz that diuers learned and pious people complained of abuses and corruption of maners and desired redresse, ther fore the Church was latent and obscure or inuisible, or yet further that that latent and obscure Church was the Church of the pretēded reformers, or that those zelous and godly persons who soe complained in generall ages, were members of the same, and not rather virtuous and religious Romanists as in deed they were, all which inferences because Sir Humfrey neither doth nor can possible proue to be sounde and legitimate, therfore he hath spent much tyme in vaine in that he maketh a large rehearsall of the speeches of such authors as haue noted the common and publike vices of their dayes, which and the like sinnes and abuses no

Romaniſt euer denyed but they may be euen in the members of tre true viſible Church.

Now to come to particulars to the end the follie of our aduerſarie may more plainely appeare I will examen ſome paſſages which he citeth out of Gerſon which being thoſe which ſeeme moſt plauſible for his cauſe when the reader ſhall ſee them declared and rectifyed, he will without anie more exacte diſcuſſion be able to iudge of others of leſſe apparence and color.

I confeſſe that Gerſon was free in his ſpeaches as being a zelous and plaine man, and a ſharpe repreſender of vices, neuertheleſſe I finde not in his writings but that he was an humble acknowledger of the Popes authoritie yea and an earneſt defender of thoſe points of doctrine which luther and the reſt of the pretended newe reformants hould for errneous and falſe opinions, for ſuperſtions and idolatrie. As the vſe of images, prayer to ſaints, Purgatorie, the ſeuen Sacraments, the reall preſence and the reſt of the matters in controuerſie betweene vs and thē: as his workes printed at Strasburg in foure partes or tomes declare, neither did he euer deſire anie reformation in the ſubſtance of theſe particulars, howe be it I denye not but that as he might finde ſome a-

de numero Sacramentorū ſciendum quod ſeptē ſunt Gerſ. 2. part. Act. 26.

es in the practise of the same, soe might he alsoe wish for amendment of them, but this is not contrarie to the doctrine and practize of the Romanists but most conformable to the same, whoe as they confesse that some things deseruing correction may creepe in to the particular members of the Church yea and into the head and cheefe pastor him selfe, soe doe they not onely desire but alsoe procure reformation of the same by all direct and lawfull meanes. And soe what soeuer Gerson saith in this nature if it be not detorted to a sense contrarie to the true meaning of the author (as here it is by Sir Humfrey) the Romanists most willingly imbrace it as profitable to the soules of manie and for the good of the vniuersall Church.

It is true Gerson speakes something harshely and by excesse when he saith: euen as wee see in like manner in some countryes touching censures and lawes inuented aboute particular obseruances or rules not necessarie to saluation which are often tymes preferred before the lawes of God and of the Gospell, And this same wee see mânifestely in the decrees and decretalls, whẽce it is that some tymes a monke is more seuerely punished for going without his hood then for cõmitting adultring or sa-

criledge, and he that offendes againſt one of the Popes commandements then he that ſinnes againſt one of the commaundemets of God, and the Euangell, according to that reprehenſion of our Sauior: you haue fruſtrated the commaundements of God for the traditions of men.

In an other place the ſame Gerſon complaines of the abuſes and ſinnes of fryers, Nunns, and preiſts of the great varietie of images which he bids the reader conſider whether they be not occaſion of idolatrie in the ſimple people: of the canonization of newe ſaints and religious orders, of which he ſaith ther are to manie alreadie, and that the feaſts of the newe ſaints are more religiouſly obſerued then the feaſts of the Apoſtles, of Apocrypſall Scriptures and prayers, ſuperſtitious opinions of obtaining remiſſion of ſinnes by ſaying ſoe manie Pater noſters in ſuch a Church before ſuch an image. And in his treatiſe de Concil. Gen. *vnius obedientiæ* he ſaith thus: if the Church may not be reformed according to the ſtate in which it was in the tyme of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, yet at leaſt it ſhould be br ough to the ſtate it was in the tyme of Pope ſyluester.

In an other place Gerſon as it were by way of complainte ſaith *in hac tempeſtate* (meaning

(meaning in that season in which he lived) he did see, matters standing as they did, that scarce anie due determination or speedie and free execution of iustice was found in doctrine appertaining to faith, religion, to good and hoalsome manners, vnlesse it were by strong fauor of the secular power.

This is that in substance which Sir Hūfrey alledgeth out of Gerson yea an something more then he him self produceth: And yet neuertheless as the reader may easily vnderstand there is nothing agreeable to the reformation of Luther and Caluin. For Gerson onely reprehends, and that iustely, some particular persons in some particular countryes and in some particular obseruations, which soe exactely and rigorously obserue their rules & lawes & soe exorbitantly estreeme of them that they often tymes by indiscreet zeale are more diligent in performing them then they are in keeping the lawes of God, and that they some tymes punish more seuerely a religious person offending against one of those monasticall rules or statutes, or against one of the Popes preceps, or lawes of the decretalls, or others, then they punish him whoe committeth adulterie or sacrilege. Wher as those twoe false reformers Martin and

Iohn were not content with this, and to procure a reformation in ſome particular perſons, rules, and ſtatues, but they tooke away all monaſticall obſeruations either of vowe, rule, or conſtitution, and extingniſſed all Eccleſiaſticall lawes both of the Pope and Church as much as lay in their power violating, euerting, and razing the verie buildings of religious houſes and conſuming by fyre the bookes of the decretals and whole Canon lawes, quyte deſtroying that and much more by rage and furie which Gerſon out of a pious & Chriſtian zeale onely wiſhed to haue amended.

ſuntque per hæc cæleſtia tonitrua ſublata prohibita & damnata omnia iſtius generis vota peniſſimè. Lut. tom. 2. fol. 372.

Gerſon complained of the euill life of fryres and nunnes with deſire to haue them reformed and reduced to the obſeruation of their ancient rules and conſtitutions, onely excepting againſt the multiplicie and varietie of religious orders: But thoſe companions in impietie Luther and Caluin would haue all religious and monaſticall diſcipline wholely extingniſhed as Sacrilegious damnable, and contrarie to the lawe of God vſing opprobrious ſpeaches againſt all Religious perſons & their profeſſion.

Gerſon tooke to conſideration whether the multitude and varietie of images might not be occaſion of idolatrie in the ſimple people yet did not he reproue the due ho-

nor of them: But our newe reformers or rather deformers either will haue no images at all in Churches as Caluinists, or at the least they will not haue them honored with religious reuerence as Lutheranes, reprouing all kinde of veneration or worship of them as superstitious and idolatrous.

Gerson onely reprehended the excesse (as he apprehended) in the canonization of soe manie newe saints & the more religious obseruation of thers feastes then of the feastes of the Apostles by some particular persons or Churches: but these twoe prophane fellowes allowe not of anie religious celebration of the feasts of either ancient or moderne saints neither of Apostles nor Euangelists, neither of confessers nor martyres, making account onely of the sabaoth day (as they cõmonly call the sunday) in that nature: alsoe houlding the canonization of noe saints for either necessarie, lawdable, or authenticall desiring rather their memories should be extinguished rhen reuerenced. Gerson likewise comdemneth instely superstitions comitted by particular persons in the worship of saints, & vaine obseruations, & ouer great credulitie giuen by them to euerie passage recounted in some inauthentichall legendes, yet admitting & defending due & moderate honor

of saints & the authentical & true histo-ries of their liues: But our pretended refor-mers reiect all religious honor of Saintes & hould the relatiõs of their liues & mira-cles for Apocriphall & fabelous at the least of moderne saints.

Gerson defended the Roman doctrine of indulgences most Catholiquely as his treatice of that matter doth testifye, and onely taxed some particular pardons of sinnes as he relates, for saying soe manie pater nosters in such a Church, before such an image, calling them superstitious opi-niõs and friuolous additions as hauing ne-uer ben approued by the Roman Church: But our newe doctors & masters Luther & Caluin vtterly condemne all sortes of In-dulgence graunted by the Pope yea and the power of the Church to graunte them.

Gersõ speakingonely of some vitious Ec-clesiastical persons reprehendes preists for that vnder the pretense of maydes they keepe cõcubines yet plainely supposing the lawe of Celibate or single life of cleargie to haue ben in vse in and before his tymes as a thing lawdable and fitting for their voca-tion: But those twoe luxurious imps the one a professed fryer, the other a vowed priest, according to their newe reformation teach

Indulgentiarum cõcessio non est parui pendenda seu contemnenda sed amplectẽda deuote, & in fide spe & charitate Domini nostri Iesu Christi qui potestatem clauium Ecclesiasticarum dedit hominibus Gerson p. 2. act. 23.

& quoniã assidue doctores sacerdotes sacris occupantur mysterijs quid diuinius quam vt continua polleant castitate. Gers. 2. part. dialog. de celib. Act. 4.

teach it lawfull and laudable for preists not obstanding their vowes of chastitie, to chãge the state of chastitie in to the state of mariage they being the first that gaue example of that sacrilegious action and leading the daunce them selues.

Gerson complaines that Cathedrall Churches are made dennes of theeues, and consecrated monasteries markets & Innes: But by the followers of Luther and Caluin, those holie cloysters are not onely made markets and Innes, but euen stables and hogstyes, & Cathedrall Churches as it were common burses or exchanges for relation of newes and negotiations, in which manifould iniustices and illicit contracts are plotted and accorded to the great profanation of the house of God ordained for onely prayer, seruice, and Sacrifyce, soe that if Gerson were now aliue doubtlesse he would rather taxe the pretended reformers in this nature then those Catholique profaners of his owne tymes.

Gerson bids inquirie robe made if ther be not Apocryphall Scriptures, and prayers introduced in the Church to the great preiudice of Christian faith, not meaning of anie Scriptures or prayers approued for Canonicall, and pious by the authoritie of the Roman Church as are the bookes of ma-

chabies,

chibies, Sapience, Ecclesiasticus, Tobie, and Indith and prayers to saints all which Gerson him selfe did receiue for such but he onely reprehendes such false Scriptures or prayers as some newfangled priuate persons had published and inuented with out warrant or authoritie of the prelates and gouernors of the Church: But Luther Caluin and their schollers peremptorily reiected and excluded out of the text and canon of scripture the foresayde bookes and some others, as also all manner of prayers to saints, euen those prayers and kookes of scripture which had ben most anciently approued and read in the seruice of the vniuersall Church at the least since the tyme of Innocet the first Pope of that name, and soe vsed in the dayes of S. Augustin and euer since till the late dayes of Luther.

And now by this breefe collation or cõparision which I haue made the reader may plainely viewe the great difference ther is betweene the desired reformation of Gerson and that of the pretended Innouators of our tymes, the one being almost quite opposite to the other: the one intending onely to redresse the Church in some particular accessorie defects, the other indeuoring violetly to destroye the whole frame and foundatiõ of the visible Church and to

build

build a newe one: and finaly the one being a reformation either wholely or cheefly in the life and maners of some corrupted persons the other cheefly in faith & doctrine and not regarding reformation of life but rather giuing more scope and liberrie to licentiousnesse then euer was heard of in the Christian world.

And altho' Gerson doth insinuate the necessitie of reformation euen in matters of faith and religion, yet doth he not meane of the faith and religion maintained approued and practized by the Roman Church, but he speaketh onely of the errours of heretikes & some abuses of other particular persons cropen into the exercise of the true religiō in which he desired reformation to the end the state of the Church may remaine and cōtinue firme in her former puritie without staine of erroneous doctrine or corrupted manners. In all which he wished the slownesse of the prelates might be hastened by the power of the secular authoritie of kings and Princes, rather then lye vnamended, with danger of the Roman faith and preiudice to the saluation of soules. Which pious zeale of that renowned chanceler was highly to be commended as farre different from the proceedings of the authors of our newe pretended

refor-

reformation who to acquire them ſelues a name of famous men vnder the colour of reforming the Church made a preye of the ſame with infinit loſſe of Chriſtian ſoules and generall domage to virtue and religious life.

More ouer I am to aduertice the reader that in the citation of this author Sir Humfrey hath cõmirted twoe notable fraudes. The firſt is in that he reherſes a great parte of his wordes as if he had founde them allogether & in one continuated order or text, wheras the author hath them in diuers places & to diuers purpoſes. For example Sir Humfrey ioyneth that which Gerſon ſaith of remiſſion of ſinnes by ſo mainie *Pater noſters*, which he hath in his treatie of Indulgences, with that other paſſage of preferring the particular obſeruations of ſome countries before the lawe of God, which he hath not in the ſame place, but in an other treatiſe intituled *de directione cordis*.

Secondly I finde thoſe wordes of Gerſon which all or moſt of them being ſpoaken by him onely of correction of manners, the knight applyeth thẽ to matters of faith to perſuade his reader that ther were corruptions in the Church euen in matters of faith, and that the chancelor procu-

red

red reformation of them. An exemple of this fraude you haue in the 650. page of the *denia*, where the knight sayth Gersō wished at the least a restoring of the ancient faith of the Fathers tyme citing for this his treatice intituled, *de Concilio Generali vnius obedientiæ*, and quoting these wordes in the margin. *Ecclesia si non ad statum Christi & Apostolorum, saltem ad statum Syluestri restituenda.* Which wordes neuertheless Gerson speaketh not of matters of faith, but onely of the prouision and collation of benefices as both his whole discourse and especially his precedent wordes doe most clearely demonstrate. Which are these. *Sed longe aliter imprimatiua dolatione distribuebantur bona talia quam postmodum tempore prælatorum qui cæperunt paulatim refrigescere a sanctitate priorum tandem abusi sunt collationibus beneficiorum & ciusmodi administratione quod Papæ ad se paulatim multa reuocauerunt vsque adeo quod finaliter datis occasionibus & acceptis quas non est hic opus recitare quasi tota iurisdictio & collatio talis pænes Papam & eius curiam remanebant.* And after theses wordes Gerson vttered those other at which Sir Humfrey catched yet according to his inueterated custome related not syncerily, which if otherwise he had truely reheharsed they would haue presently discouered the truth and

donatione.

of

of what matter they were deliuered, for Gerſon ſaith: *vel redeundum eſſet ad ſtatum Eccleſiæ tempore ſylueſtri & Gregorij quando quilibet Prælatus dimittebatur in ſua iuriſdictione & ſollidudinis parte.* nowe let the reader confer all theſe wordes of Gerſon with the citation of Sir humfrey in the page aboue noted & he will preſently perceiue howe he hath corrupted thē both in tenor and ſenſe, and how he hath foyſted in the worde *Eccleſia* wher it is not to be founde in the text of the author.

As alſoe in the place taken out of Gerſons in his conſolatorie tract of rectifyind the hart, he tranſpoſeth and mangleth his wordes leauing out the worde *particular:* and for the wordes *in aliquibus religionibus*, tranſlating, *in manie conuents* puting *manie* in ſteede of *ſome*. And where the ſame Gerſon in an other place complaining of the imperfections and vices of the regular and ſecular Cleargie doth explica te him ſelfe not to meane of all but of ſome particular perſons, Sir Humfrey guilefully omits his wordes which are theſe. *Sed nunquid hodie omnes Domini & Pælati in intedictis & poſt dicendis culpabiles ſunt malis? abſit, reliquit enim Dominus ſibi in Iſraell ſeptem millia virorum quorum genua non ſunt curuata ante Baal.* and where the author ſpeaking of diſorders of

the

the monasteries of nunnes and fryres vseth the worde *quasi* to giue the reader aduertisement that he speaketh not absolutely but onely by way of comparison: the maliti- ous knight leaues it out, as if it were not to the purpose, as he omits alsoe the worde *nō nunqnam* when the author speakes of the dāger which some tymes happeneth among the simple sorte by reason of the multiplicitie of such things as he ther mentioneth. *In cōsolat.*

In like manner in an other tract in wheras the Chancelor at the first making some doubt of the obtaining of a certaine Indulgence by saying soe manie *Pater nosters* before an image of the Crucifix, yet afterwardes doth moderate his owne speeches soe that it plainely apppeares he doth not condemne the same, the fraudulent knight soe relateth the passage as if Gerson had not onely taxed that forme of indulgēce in particular but alsoe had absolutely renoūced the Romā doctrine touching the lawfullnes of Indulgē ces in generall: his wordes are these *Circa hæc itaque & similia multum caute procedendum est & prouidendum, ne opponatur firma vel pertinax credulitas propter erroris periculum neque etiam oportet eiusmodi omnino & pertinaciter dissentire, nec etiam penitus contemnere & improbare, est igitur ambulandum in his via*

media

medio &c. by which and other the like ſubmiſſiue & temperate wordes which he hath afterwardes in the ſame place, the reader may ſee Gerſon was as farre from being one of the newe reformers as is the ſpirit of humilitie frome the ſpirit of pride and contempte, which is the onely guide of all thoſe whoe reiect and impugne the Roman doctrine in all points of controuerſie.

Finally in thoſe wordes cited by Sir Hũfrey out of Gerſons Apolotgeticall dialog, wheras the author ſpeakes in the caſe of ſciſme when the true Pope was not certainely knowne, and cheefely of one particular point to wit of the condemnation of that propoſition, *a tyranne may be lawfully killed by priuate authoritie or by anie priuate man.* the deceitfull knight ſoe applyes the wordes as if Gerſon had generally diſpared of the reformation of the Church, and the more eaſily to perſuade his reader he omittes the wordes, *hac tempeſtate* and thoſe *rebus vt ſunt manentibus*. Gerſons wordes truly rehearſed are theſe. *video quod in doctrinis quæ religionem, quæ bonas & ſalubres reſpiciunt mores, vix inuenietur in hac tempeſtate (rebus vt ſunt manimentibus nec habito forti fauore potentiæ ſæcularis) terminatio debita vel expedita iuſtitia* Which wordes if the reader compares them with the wordes cited in Engliſh

by

by the knight he will eafily ſpye more faultes then I haue noted. And then from hẽce, and the reſt which I haue produced touching the whole allegation of Gerſon he will be able to iudge both of the falſe dealing of our aduerſarie & how ſmale reaſon he had to indeuore to make that famous and renowned Romaniſt one of the blind brothers of his inuiſible Congregation. But now for concluſiõ & plainer intellectiõ or vnderſtanding of that which I haue ſaid touching this author, the reader muſt take noticie that Gerſon liued in a tyme of a great ſciſme raſed by the erroneous election of diuers Popes by diuers partes of the faction, by reaſon of which ſtrife finding in his iudgement no other meanes to bring matters to a peaceable iſſue and attonemẽt then by giuinge greater authoritie to a generall Councell then to the Pope, he preferred the power of a Councel before the authoritie of the Pope: which ſciſme alſoe was the true cauſe why he likewiſe ſeemed to diſpare of the reformatiõ of the Church, and therfore he labored to haue a generall Councell vnder one Pope by occaſion of which deſire he writ his trearie intituled *De Cõcilio vnius obedientiæ* to deliberate the cõpoſing of the Eccleſiaſticall debatea and Papal diſſentiõ all which is by himſelfe clearely

rely deliuered in ſeuerall places of his workes and particularly in his Apolageticall dialog fol. 75. ſaying. *hoc vnum ſcio quod zelus habendæ vnionis in ſciſmate tam deſperato tantique temporis, fecit multa tolerari quæ ſuiſſent alioqui nec tolerabilia nec toleranda &c.* And now by this it is ſufficiently cleare that Gerſon is not for the new reformation of moderne ſectaries in anie one pointe of doctrine or manners.

In his citation of Cuſanus lib. 3. concod. Cath. cap 16. the kinght hath in his owne page 378. 8. 9. of the by-way notably corrupted him, for he rehearefes his wordes without anie order, & alſoe quite contrarie to his ſenſe & meaning as that authors owne wordes moſt euidently conuince in his 17. chapter following, where he hath this plaine clauſe *Ecce quod de pertinentibus ad religionem Imperator inter Epiſcopos indicare non debet.* Et in his 18. chapter he ſaith thus. *Firmitas autem iudicij & omnium quæ ita aguntur in concilio per quoſcunque ex conſenſu tantum, ſynodica dependent authoritate. Quare etſi aliquando ſententiaſſe indices tales leguntur, ex conſenſu & ſynodica commiſſione vigor ſententiæ dependebat, & non ex imperiali cõmiſſione, cuius authoritas ſynodum virilem non præcellit.* Thus much Cuſanus touching iudicatiue authoritie in generall councels, which

which as is plaine by these wordes doth not depend vpon the Emperor. It is true Cusanus grauntes (I knowne not how truely) that he fyndes the Emperor did alwayes *præsidere* that is preced or take the first place in the councels, but he doth not say (as Sir Humfrey feysteth in) *primatum habuit, he had the primacie.* But onely graunteth the Emperor & his iudges with the senate, locall preheminence before the Pope or at the most depending on the Pope, & councell, as his whole discourse in diuers chapters of the booke cited by the kingth. manifestely declare.

And cõcerning the cõgregation or conuocation of generall Councels, it is almost euident out of the precedent chapters of the same booke that this author graũtes no Primacie to the Emperor, but cheefely to the Pope. For altou' in the begining of the 13. chapter he hath these expresse wordes *ex superioribus habetur Imperatores sanctos congregationes synodales vniuersalis concilij totius Ecclesiæ sæpe fecisse.* Yet presẽtly after explicaing him selfe better he saith. *Breuiter dico quod ita se habet Imperator ad vniuersalẽ Ecclesiæ Catholicæ synodum, sicut Rex ad vniuersale Regni sui concilium, non quod coactiue sed cohortatiue colligere debet.* And yet more plainely presently after. *Vigilare debet Imperator & fi-*

dei & pacis custos, & Romani Pontificis primò synodi necessitatem insinuare, & eius consensum congregandi concilij in definito loco requirere. By all which it doth manifestly appeare how shamelessely the kinght abuseth Cusanus, & how smale reason he had to produce his testimonie for the Popes vsurpation (as he termeth it) both in calling & assuming preheminence of place & dignitie, in Councels, supposing that author (as being Cardinall of the Popes creation) soe professedly maintaines his authoritie both in the resolutorie assembling & cõfirming of generall synods.

And if the reader desire greater satisfactiõ concerning the doctrine of this author about the Popes authoritie in Councels, let him please to read his epistle to Roderic, & he will easily perceiue howe plainely he purgeth himself from all sinister imputation in that nature: and that if perhaps in his immature age when he writ his Catholique concordance by reason of the great fame which he conceiued of the Councel of Basill, he inconsiderately vttered anie thing which might seeme to diminish the power of the Bishop of Rome in respect of a generall Councell: yet afterwardes perceiuing that those who preferred the authoritie of Councels before the authoritie

of

of the cheefe Bishop & pastor the Church proceeded soe farre as to attempt the election of the Antipope Fœlix, against the true Pope Eugenius, then presently he repented him self that he had soe much extolled their schismaticall synod, imitating in this both Cardinall Iulian & Æneas Sylvius, whoe both of them in the begining defended the Councell of Basill against Eugenius the true Pope, yet in the end retracting their action maintained most earnestly his authoritie against the same synod. That which is sufficient to manifest the inconsideration, ignorance & insyncritie of Sir Humfrey in his production of this author whoe suppose he had deliuered his mynde lesse clearely in one place & occasion, yet did he amend the same in another more exact worke of his owne hand & industrie, & of his owne accorde, how be it althou' our aduersarie takes him at the greatest aduantage he can, yet rightly vnderstanded & alledged he doth not a iot aduantage his cause.

In his citation of the Rhemes Testament in the annotation vpon the 6: of the Epistle the Hebrewes v. 16. the knight relateth wordes in which the author of the notes affirmes that God should be iniust if he rendered not heauen for meritorious workes,

kes, But to make the matter more odious he craftely omittes the wordes of S. Hierome there cited for proofe of the same lib. 2. contra Iouinianum cap. 2. saying that in deed great were Gods iniustice if he would onely punish sinnes and would not receiue good workes. And if that cõditionall of the Rhemists be not iustifyable, then may our aduersarie more iustely taxe, S. Augustin who lib. de nat, and Grat cap. 2. And lib. 4. contra Iulianum cap. 3. gaue them examples of that forme of speech. Saying in the first place. *non est iniustus Deus qui iustos fraudet mercede iustitiæ*, and in the second, *per quod non a iustitia per hoc & regnum Dei. Deus namque ipse, quod absit, erit iniustus, si sua eius regnum non admittitur iustis*. Wherfore except Sir Humfrey will ioyne in his accusation those two renound ancient Fathers, he can not in reason accuse those learned doctors.

Althou I conceiue it may seeme vnseasonable to my present purpose distinctly to treate of anie matter of doctrine in this place and occasion: yet in regarde I haue lately reflected that Sir Humfrey professes him selfe an enimie to implicit or vnexpressed faith, therfore I esteemed conuenient for the accomplishing of my worke, to

insert

insert a compendious discourse touching that point.

And to come to the purpose, I can not conceiue or inuente anie other motiue in our aduersaries for their soe obstinate denyall of vnexpressed faith, except it is because euerie one of them confidently presumes to knowe the expresse contents of Scriptures as well as him who made them, yet on the contrarie I am alluredly persuaded that in reallitie a verie great parte (if not all their congregatiō) inioyes not this great extrauagant priuilege what soeuer they imagin, or conceiue of them selues. For altho it is true that the illuminate brothers generally vse to brag they are *docibiles Dei*, and admit noe other schoolemaster in this matter then God almightie him selfe: yet is it certainely knowne that some of them be soe ignorant that they knowe not as much as their Abcedarie, or Christ crosse rowe. And now of these whoe can not read the Bible, I question our aduersaries thus, either these ignorants beleeue althings contained in the whole scripture, or no? If they doe not, then they ar heretikes for refusing to beleeue the whole worde of God. If they doe beleeue all, and euerie particular contained in the Scripture, then necessarily they must haue an implicit faith, in regarde

manie particular truethes be there included which they can not possibly knowe by reason they can neither haue them selues, nor receiue a perfect knowlege from anie other of euerie seuerall trueth therin contained; and consequently, if anie faith they haue of those particular verities contained in the Scripture which they knowe not, it is onely an implicit, vnexpressed, or implied faith supposing this consists in nothing esse but a generall faith euen of those particulars of which the beleeuers haue no expresse knowledge, except onely in a certaine cõfuse or generall manner, or as they ar contained in other generall propositions, or matters, which expressely and seuelally they know to be reueiled in the worde of God, and of which they haue an explicit, expresse, or disinuolued faith. For as he who expressely graunteth, or assents to anie general Principle or proposition, for example, that all Angels ar incorporall, or without bodies, or that all men ar reasonable creatures, doth by necessarie consequens assent implicitly to all the particulars there included, viz, that S. Michael S. Gabriel, and euerie other particular Angel is incorporal, and that S. Peter, and Paule, and euerie other particular man is a reasonable creature altho' he neuer had anie particular

knowlege

knowledge of them: Soe in the verie same manner those whoe with an expresse act of faith beleeue al the Church proposeth vnto them in that kynde, or all the scripture conteines: doe likewise necessarily beleeue with an implicit or tacit faith euerie seuerall matter included in those general tearmes.

And this kynde of implicit faith, our aduersaries must either graunt, or else necessarily confesse that euerie Mecanike hath as much knowlege in the Scripture as the most learned Minister, and euerie sheep as much as his pastor: which neuertheless euerie rude rustick is able to iudge for most absurde, and voyde of trueth. Soe thus we see that of the denyal of an implicit faith eyther the ignorant, and vnlearned sorte of people in the pretensiue reformed Churches knowe as much in the Scripture as their greatest doctors: or that they ar plaine heretikes because they beleeue no more in the Bible but that onely which they expressely knowe.

And the same I say with proportion euen of the learned sorte them selues, in regarde they seldome, or neuer ar soe conuersant in Scriptures that they expleessely knowe euerie seueral proposition, or particular truth conteined in the text, and consequē-

tly

tly euen they who ar the greateſt Rabbies in their reformed flock, haue no explicit, or expreſſe faith conſiſting in an aſſent to all they expreſſely knowe in the text of ſcripture, but they muſt as well as theire brothers, be content with an implicit faith of thoſe particulars they expreſſely knowe not, or elſe they ar to be accounted heretikes for not beleeuing them, as I ſaid before of the ruder ſorte In reſpect of both which ſortes of people I meane both the learned and vnlearned beleeuers in the pretenſiue reformed Churches, this ſame argumẽt may yet farther be vrged euen according to their owne receiued doctrine by which they cõfeſſe they haue not all their faith expreſſely in the ſcriptures, but parte of it drawne by their owne conſequences, or deductions from the text of ſcripture: of all which illations or inferences of theirs it is manifeſt they could not poſſible haue anie other faith of them then implicit or vnexpreſſed, before they made them, in regare that thoſe ſuppoſed verities or truethes which they ſoe deduce were not otherwiſe contained in the text or deliuered to the Church then in that incluſiue or hidden manner as it moſt apparent in regarde that if otherwiſe they had ben contained in the ſcripture that is clearely or expreſſely, then no illation or

deduc-

deduction had ben necessarie for beleeuers for the knowledge and establishing of their faith in those particulars, as both natural reason, and euen common sense conuince: and consequently either the pretensiue reformers had an implicit faith of all those obiects which they nowe confesse themselues to beleeue according to that deductiue manner, or else they had noe faith at all of them before they were deduced: whence it farther followes that euer since they made their foresaid illations or consequences their faith is newe and quyte distinct from their owne faith in former tymes: the absurditie of which most necessarie sequele I remit to the censure of the reasonable, and indicious learned reader to determine.

By occasion of this I desire the reader to take yet more cleare notice of the great peruersitie of the preposterous Nouellists, who as they reueile their violēce in reprouing the foresaid receiued doctrine of implicit or inexpressed faith, soe likewise they ar no lesse peremptorie in defending their owne newe distinction of fundamental and not fundamental points in Religion, according to which their position they obstinately maintaine the Church can erre in matters of faith, that is in such points of faith

as

as in their conceite ar not foundamentall.

But againſt the falſitie of this diſtinction I argue firſt vpon their owne ſuppoſed principle to wit that nothing is to be beleeued in matters of faith which is not founde in ſcripture either explicitly and clearely, or by cleare and certaine conſequence wherfore this doctrinal diſtinctiõ of theirs being a matter of faith and yet not founde in ſcripture in either of thoſe two manners related, plaine it is that according to the pretended reformers doctrine, it neither deſerues faith nor credit. More ouer this diſtinction is ſoe newely coyned by our aduerſaries and ſoe farre from haning anie foundation either in ſcripture or ancient doctors that I neuer read anie mention of it in the firſt and cheefe eſtabliſhers of the pretended reformatiõ. Onely Chamier who is in deed a violent defender of Caluiniſme in his booke *de natura Eccleſiæ*, ſeemes plainely to ſuppoſe the ſame diſtinction in ſubſtance affirming that the Catholique Church can erre, *licet non in fundamento ſalutis; tho' not in the foundation of ſaluation.* Cap. 13. num. 11.

Yet Chamier haueing writ his Panſtratia but of late yeares either our Engliſh Nouelliſts receiued it from him, or inuented it themſelues not long before ſoe that the noueltie of it a lone were ſufficient to conuince

uince it of vntrueth and vanitie. And altho' I might iuſtely take exceptions at the worde it ſelfe for the newneſſe of it according to the Apoſtles counſel to Timomothie to auoyde profane nouelties of wordes, in regarde the worde *not fundamentals* as it is applyed to matters of faith and thee errors of the Church ther in by our aduerſaries, it is a kynde of profanation both of diuine faith it ſelfe which is truely fundamental in al reſpects, and alſo of the authoritie of the Church which likewiſe is infallible as much in one matter as an other: Neuerthel eſſe my cheefe intention is not to inſiſte in the reproofe of wordes (which I graunt may vpon occaſion and for better declaration of a trueth, be inuented and vſed by the Churches authoritie) but I onely ſtande vpon the ſenſe or obiect of them, directely conuinceing the matter ſignifyed by thoſe wordes *not fundamental in faith* to be repugnant both to ſcripture and, Fathers. That which I proue by a ſeconde argument of the ſame nature to wit becauſe the ſcripture expreſſely teaches that *the Church is a pillar or firmament of truth*. And our Sauior promiſſeth his Father *will giue to his Apoſtles* (and their ſucceſſors) *an other Paraclete* the ſpirit of trueth to remaine with them for euer, which ſame diuine Spirit (as he him

1, Tim. 3. Eccleſia eſt

Ioan. 14.

Ioan. 16.

as in their conceite ar not foundamentall.

But against the falsitie of this distinction I argue first vpon their owne supposed principle to wit that nothing is to be beleeued in matters of faith which is not founde in scripture either explicitly and clearely, or by cleare and certaine consequence wherfore this doctrinal distinctiō of theirs being a matter of faith and yet not founde in scripture in either of those two manners related, plaine it is that according to the pretended reformers doctrine, it neither deserues faith nor credit. More ouer this distinction is soe newely coyned by our aduersaries and soe farre from hauing anie foundation either in scripture or ancient doctors that I neuer read anie mention of it in the first and cheefe establishers of the pretended reformatiō. Onely Chamier who is in deed a violent defender of Caluinisme in his booke *de natura Ecclesiæ*, seemes plainely to suppose the same distinction in substance affirming that the Catholique Church can erre, *licet non in fundamento salutis*; *tho' not in the foundation of saluation.*

Cap. 13. num. 11.

Yet Chamier haueing writ his Panstratia but of late yeares either our English Nouellists receiued it from him, or inuented it themselues not long before soe that the noueltie of it a lone were sufficient to conuince

uince it of vntrueth and vanitie. And altho' I might iuſtely take exceptions at the worde it ſelfe for the newneſſe of it according to the Apoſtles counſel to Timomothie to auoyde profane nouelties of wordes, in regarde the worde *not fundamentals* as it is applyed to matters of faith and thee errors of the Church ther in by our aduerſaries, it is a kynde of profanation both of diuine faith it ſelfe which is truely fundamental in al reſpects, and alſo of the authoritie of the Church which likewiſe is infallible as much in one matter as an other: Neuerthel eſſe my cheefe intention is not to inſiſte in the reproofe of wordes (which I graunt may vpon occaſion and for better declaration of a trueth, be inuented and vſed by the Churches authoritie) but I onely ſtande vpon the ſenſe or obiect of them, directely conuinceing the matter ſignifyed by thoſe wordes *not fundamental in faith* to be repugnant both to ſcripture and, Fathers. That which I proue by a ſeconde argument of the ſame nature to wit becauſe the ſcripture expreſſely teaches that *the Church is a pallar or firmament of truth*. And our Sauior promiſſeth his Father *will giue to his Apoſtles* (and their ſucceſſors) *an other Paraclete* the ſpirit of trueth to remaine with them for euer, which ſame diuine Spirit (as he him

1. *Tim.* 3. *Eccleſia eſt*

Ioan. 14.

Ioan. 16.

him ſelfe declares afterwardes in the 16. chapter will teache them all trueth, which vniuerſal terme *all*, includes and ſignifyes both fundamental and not fundamental truethes, and conſequently it expreſſely excludeth this vaine diſtinction of the nouellists. To which purpoſe S. Cyrill vpon the 10. chapter of the ſame Euangeliſt ſpeakes moſt fittly and appoſitly ſaying, that althou' in this life we knowe onely in parte as S. Paule affirmes, *non manca tamen ſed integra veritas in hac parua cognitione nobis reſulſit: yet not a meamed or imperfect, but an intyre true faith ſhined vnto vs in this ſmale knowledge.* And the place now cited out of the firſt to Tim. 3. is by all interpreters of ſcripture both ancient and moderne expounded of the firmenes and ſtabilitie which the Church hath by the aſſiſtance of the holie Goſte in her deliuerie of true doctrine to her particular members, conformable to which ſenſe Tertullian (to omit the reſt for breuitie) in the 28. of his preſcriptions hath a moſt fine ſentence as it were in deriſion of thoſe who teach the vniuerſal or Catholique Churche can erre in matters of faith. *Could not* (ſaith hee) *the holie Goſte haue reſpected her ſoe much as to haue indured her into all truth, he hauing ben ſent by Chriſt to this ende hauing ben requyred by his Father to*

be the Doctor of trueth, should villicus Christi vicarius the stewarde, the vicar of Christ haue neglected the office of God suffering the Churches in the meane tyme to vnderstande and beleeue otherwise then he him selfe preached by the Apostles, Thus plainely, generally & absolutely ancient Tertullian of the infallibilitie of the Catholique Churche in points of doctrine and faith.

And nowe farther supposing that al these passages both of the scripture & their expositors ar absolute, general, & sans limitation, it is most apparent they can admit no such distinction in their true sense & interpretation, but that at the leaste the catholique Churche can not teache or beleeue anie error at all in such things as ar contained within the total obiect of faith in which ther can not possible be anie parte or partial which is not fundamental by reason that all kinde of diuine faith is the verie foundation of Religion & christian iustice according to the saying of S. Augustin. *Domus Dei fide fundatur, the house of God is founded in faith:* & if the foundation of the house of God were faultie, it would doubtlesse fall to ruine, contrarie to his owne promisse or affirmation viz. That the gates of hell shal not preuaile against it.

Neither

Neither is it anaileable for our aduerſaries to ſaye that the Church can not erre in the cheefe articles of her faith, as ar the Trinitie, the Incarnation of Chriſt, which ar fundamentals: but in ſuch points as ar not fundamental, as ar the reall preſence, iuſtification, the true quantitie, & ſenſe of Canonical ſcriptures, & other ſuch like matters in controuerſie with vs & them, the Church may teache erroneous & falſe doctrine.

For thir euaſion I replie it is grounded not in inuincible, but in vincible & groſſe ignorance of the nature of true faith which being in it ſelfe one ſimple, or ſingle entitie or eſſence as according to the doctrine of the Apoſtle, God & Baptiſme ar. *Vna fides, vnum Baptiſma, vnus Deus*; how different ſoeuer its obiect be, it is euer eſſentially one & the ſame in it ſelfe cleare from diſtinction, & cleare from error, the cõtrarie to which neuertholeſſe ſhould neceſſarily be true if ei faith were diuided in to fundamental & not fundamental faith, & the Church could erre in her propoſitiõ of the one & not of the other. And to this I adde that one propertie of the true Church is holines: but now what ſanctitie, integritie, or holines can poſſible be in the Church if it be infected with errors in faith of what nature ſoe

euer

euer they bee. For as the ſcripture affirmes, *ſine fide* (that is true, pure, & intyre faith) *impoſſibile eſt placere Deo*. True faith is the forme, faſhiõ, & beautie of the Church which is the immaculate ſponſe of Chriſt not hauing ſpot or wrincle. In ſoe much that if ſhe be defaced thus with errors ſhe can not poſſible be the ſponſe of Chriſt as in the cided place, & like wiſe in the Canticles ſhe is deſcribed, all faire, or comely, but rather ſhe would be like a leaper, or moſt deformed creature.

Thirdly, I confeſſe for my parte I could neuer perfectly vnderſtand what the Nouelliſts truely meane by fundamental & not fundamental points, by reaſon I finde the matter in noне of their workes ſufficiently explicated, & I veriely cõceiue they purpoſely anoyde the declaration of it, to the ende the abſurditie may leſſe appeare. Neuertheleſſe it ſeemes in probabilitie that by fundamentals they meane all thoſe points which according to their owne expoſition ar contained in ſcriptures, & the three creedes. And by not fundamentals the points of controuerſie betwixt vs & the: as is the number of Canonical bookes, the infallible rule of interpretation of ſcriptures, the real preſence, tranſubſtantiation, iuſtification &c.

This being supposed I argue thus. Either those points which our aduersaries call not fundamentals, ar matters of faith & to be beleeued by all sortes of Christians according to the diuersitie of their tenets, vnder paine of damnation, or not to be beleeued. If they ar thus necessarily to be beleeued by faith, then doubteles they ar included in those truthes touching which, (as I haue declared & cõfirmed before by both scriptures & Fathers) Christ promised to his Church the assistance of the diuine Sprit to remaine with it eternally, that is till the consummation of the worlde, and consequently the Church can not committe anie error in proposing them to the people as being no lesse fundamental in that respect then anie of the rest of the articles of faith.

But if our aduersaries on the contrarie denye them to be necessarily beleeued vnder paine of losse of Saluatiõ, & hould thẽ onely as matters of indifferencie, & such as may either be beleeued or not be beleeued without preiudice of faith: or mãners vpon this supposition I graunte the Church may erre in proposing thẽ to her flock, but yet in this case that parte of our aduersaries distinctiõ affirming that the Church can erre in not fũdamẽtal matters of faith is still false and impertinẽt in regarde those particulars

lars aboue telated in which they teache the Church can erre, ar soe farre from being either fundamentals or not fundamentals in matter of faith, that according to the former suppositon they ar not either one way or other with in the circuit of faith: and consequently that parte or member of our aduersaries diuistinction viz that the Church can erre in not fundamentals is both false, nugatorie, and impertinent in which sense soeuer they intend to maintaine it.

Fourtly I proue directly that the affirmatiues euen of those particulars controuerted betwixt vs and the professors of the English Religion, ar fundamental points of faith, and by consequence that if the Church can erre in them that parte of their new distinction is false according to which they auerre the Church can not erre in fundamental points of Religion: which I conuince in this forme of argument.

That distinction is false and absurde according to which it necessarily followes that the Church can erre in matters the true faith of which is necessarie to saluation.

But according to the distinction of fundamental, and not fundamental matters

of faith it neceſſarily followes the Church can erre in matters neceſſarie to ſaluation.

Ergo The diſtinction of fundamental, and not fundamental matters of faith, is a falſe and abſurde diſtinction.

The minor in which the total difficultie conſiſts, I proue becauſe according to this diſtinction, the Church may erre in theſe propoſitions. The Church hath the true complete Canon of ſcripture, The Church hath the true interpretation and ſenſe of ſcripture. Chriſts bodie and bloud are truely, really, ſubſtantially, and not by onely faith contained in the ſacred Euchariſt &c. And yet the faith of theſe either affirmatiuely or negatiuely, is neceſſarie to ſaluatiõ, as the aduerſaries thẽ ſelues if they will not be accounted obſtinate in a matter ſoe cleare and manifeſt, can not denye. Therfore it is hence concluded by forcible ſequele that their diſtinction of fundamentals, and not fundamentals in matters of faith is falſe and abſurde.

Fiftely, I reaſon in this manner againſt the ſame diſtinction. If the infallibilitie of the Churches authoritie conſiſtes in fundamental points of Religion onely, and not in all that the true Church ſhal at anie tyme declare vnto her members concerning their faith and Religion, then were

not

not the prouidence of Christ perfect towardes his sponse, but more defectiue then God was towardes the synagog of the Iewes, neither were this anie other then to imagine that Christ in deede did laye a founde foundation for his Church, but lefte walles and roofe exposed to be deiected or caste to grounde with euerie puffe of winde which how repugnant to reason & his owne inuiolable promisse this is, the reader may easily consider, and censure.

Sixtly, I argue yet more positiuely against the distinction related because, our aduersaries frame it either in respect of the greater, or lesser dignitie of the obiects of fundamental and not fundamental points of faith in them selues, or in respect of the greater or lesse necessitie of them to saluation by reason of the necessitie of faith which the members of the true Church haue of them all and euerie one in particular, Now if we respect onely the material obiects in them selues, and the necessitie of them to saluation precisely, soe I confesse ther ar some particular matters of faith which much surpasse orhers, and in that respect alsoe the one may not vnaptely be termed fundamental in comparision of the rest which haue not that preheminencie. For example that ther is a God, and that

God is a rewarder of workes quod *Deus eſt, & remunerator ſit*. That he is one in three perſons, that the ſecond perſon in Trinitie became incarnate or tooke humaine nature vpon him, was borne of the Virgin Marie, ſuffered death for our dedemption &c. are matters both more noble and dignifiable in them ſelues, then thoſe: Chriſt faſted fortie dayes, and fortie nights, an Angel appeared to him in his agonie, Peter denyed Chriſt, and other ſuch like truthes, Yet this how true ſoeuer it bee, it is nothing to the purpoſe which here we treate, nor afordeth anie grounde or foundation for the prenominated diſtinction of our aduerſaries, in regarde that althou' ther be neuer ſoe great difference among thoſe and other points of Religion in the dignitie of the material obiects, by reaſon of which in ſome ſorte the one may be named fundamental, the other not fundamental: neuertheleſſe becauſe the faith of the one is no leſſe neceſſarie to ſaluatiõ then the faith of the other, thẽce it is that abſolutely the one is as much fundamental as the other and conſequently ther ar no not fundamentals in matters of faith as the diſtinction of out aduerſaries doth falſely ſuppoſe.

And hence in like manner it farther inſueth, that if the Church ſhould erre but

onely in the definitiõ, or propoſition euen of thoſe matters of leſſe qualitie, the error would be directly againſt diuine faith, and conſequently the Church in this caſe ſhould truely be ſaid to haue erred eued in fundamental points of faith, and in matters neceſſarie to ſaluation, fundamental points, as I haue declared and often repeated, being no other then all thoſe reuailed truethes the faith of which is neceſſarie in the members of the Church for the obtaining of eternal life, not obſtanding anie difference which otherwiſe may apppeare in the nature of the ſeueral obiects or matters, ſuppoſing no one parte but the whole intyre faith of Chriſt and euerie parte and partiall of thoſe verities which he hath reuailed to his Church, is the foundation of true Chriſtian, and Catholique Religion, it being as neceſſarie to ſaluation for euerie true Chriſtian to beleeue truely and ſyncerely if it be propoſed vnto him by the Church that the cocke crowed at the tyme of S. Peters denyal of Chriſt, or that a ſouldier lanced our ſauiors ſide with a ſpeare, as that he dyed vpon the Croſſe for our redemption, and riſe againe for our iuſtification.

But finally, If peraduenture our aduerſaries ſhould ſay that within the compaſſe of true

faith some things be necessarie to saluation and others not necessarie, and that consequently some things be fundamental, but others not.

To this instance I replye, it is founded in a manifest equiuocation. For althou it is true that their be some things within the compasse of faith which ar not necessarie for euerie member of the Church to knowe them expressely, yet is it necessarie to saluation for euerie faithfull Christian thou neuer soe simple or ignorant, to beleeue euerie parte and partiall of those obiects or matters which God hath reuailed, if for such by the Church they be proposed vnto him, otherwise he should incurre the censure of that strict and fearefull sentence of the most iuste and equal iudge Christ our Sauior, *qui vero non credideriț condemnabitur*: and soe the faith euen of all those things which euerie one by reason of his state or condition of life, or for want of vnderstanding is not obleiged to knowe, is necessarie to saluation, and consequently all kinde of faith of what matter soeuer it be that God hath reuailed, is as much fundamentall as is faith of the greateſt matter or mysterie of the whole Christiã beleefe: whence it is that as S. Gregorie Nazianzen treating of the vnitie and integritie of faith in

his 39 oratiõ aboute the ende declareth by example or similitude that faith is like vnto a goulden chaine connected and compounded of diuers linkes, from which if you take anie one away, you loose your saluation as S. Ambrose in the ende of his sixt booke vpon the Euangell of S. Luke declares. By which it is manifeste that faith of euerie point or matter within the compasse of faith, is necessarie to saluation and therefore fundamental absolutely, whether the obiect be great or little, and no faith not fundamẽtal, as the new distinction of the Nouellists most falsely affirmes: which ther distinction doubtnesse was inuented by them to the ende they might haue a more plausible coulor to accuse the Roman Church of errors comitted in faith, (as also for excuse of ther owne) their malice and irreligion being so great that like vnconscionable taylers they chose rather to cutte out a Church for Christ of such corrupted stuffe as this, then to liue or dye vnreuenged of the Catholique Roman Church.

And for conclusion I adde that since I haue made manifest by these my reasons that the faith euen of those points of Religion which our aduersaries terme not fundamentall, is absolutely required to the sal-

uation of euerie Christian soule, if euen in these particulars onely the Church could erre, none could assuredly be persuaded that by makeing them selues members of it, they ar in the certaine & infallible way to the obteining of eternal blessednes, but still should remaine on the like dangerous & desperate state they did before they were in the Church of Christ, & cõsequently by reason of this vncertaintie & perill a generall neglect of procuring to enter in to the true Church of Christ would be caused in the mindes of men, which inconuenience in regarde it procedes by inuoiable cõsequence from this distinction broached & vsed by our aduersaries, it plainely appeeres the doctrine of it is in diuers respect most pernicious & damnable as not tending in anie sorte to the reformatiõ of the Church, as is by them pretended, but directely to the ruine & destruction of it.

Deuia. sec. 3. pag. 45.

S. Augustin in the 23. chap. of the 3. booke of his cõfessions affirming that spiritual men must not iudge of the scripture, is corrupted by Sir Hũfrey, for he meaneth not that spiritual men must not in anie case iudge of the true sense of scripture for that were both false, yea & repugnant to the doctrine & practise euen of the pretensiue reformers them selues who as they can

not

not denye, whether they be ſpiritual or not ſpirituall vſe to read & interpret ſcriptures much more comonly then the Romaniſts doe: yea & giue libertie therin euen to thoſe of the feminine ſexe or gender. But the true & obuious ſenſe of that diuine doctor in the cited place onely is, that ſpirituall men muſt not iudge anie thing contained in the ſcripture (as preſently he ſubioines) *non rite veraciterque dictum eſſe*, that is, *not to be ritely & truelly ſpoken*, but ſubmit their vnderſtanding, *etiamſi quid ibi non lucet* altou ſome thing be not cleare, or perſpicuous in it. This is the pure & ſyncere ſenſe of S. Auguſtin as his verie wordes declare, And nowe let the impartial reader decide whether it doth not rather militate or warre againſt the manner of dealing with ſcriptures which the Noueliſts practiſe, then againſts the Romaniſts: how be it I ſyncerely confeſſe it directly makes neither againſt the one nor the other, but preciſely againſt ſuch as iudge thoſe paſſages of ſcripture to be falſe, or not ritely deliuered, which they ar not able to vnderſtand. *Spirituales ergo ſiue qui preſunt, ſiue qui obtemperant, ſpiritualiter iudicant: non de ſpiritualibus cogitationibus quæ latent in firmamento. Non enim oportet de ſublimi authoritate iudicare, neque etiam de ipſo libro tuo: etiamſi quid ibi non*

lucet

lucet quoniam submittimus ei nostrum intellectum certumque habemus etiam quod clausum est aspectibus nostris recte veraciterque dictum esse. Sic enim homo licet iam spiritualis & renouatus in agnitionem Dei secundum imaginem eius qui creauit eum, factor tamen legis debet esse, non index. Theſe ar the wordes of S. Auguſtin ſyncerely rehearſed in which as anie vnderſtander of latin may eaſily perceiue, ther is nothing founde in fauor of Sir Humfreys tenet in the place aboue cited, viz that ſcripture is the ſole iudge of controuerſies & interpreter of it ſelfe: but rather is ther ſome thing expreſſely repugnant to an other poſition of his congregation defending that ſcriptures ar eaſie to be vnderſtanded or interpreted onely by conferring one place with an other, the contrarie of which neuerteleſſe, is plainely inſinuated by thoſe wordes of S. Auguſtin, *certumque habemus etiam quod clauſum eſt aſpectibus noſtris &c. And we ar certaine euen that which is ſhutte from our eyes, is ritely & truely ſpoken.* And yet our corrupt aduerſarie hath corruptedly interrupted them conioyning the firſt parte to the laſt & omitting the verie harte of the ſentence, & for the latin wordes *ſpiritualibus cogitationibus*, putting in Engliſh, ſpiritual knowledge, for *ſpiritual cogitations*: like wiſe inſerting by a parente-

theſis

this his owne gloſſe vpon the worde *firmament* expounding it of the ſcriptures them ſelues I knowe not by what other rule or authorite then by the dictamen of his owne priuate or familiar ſpirit: all which particulars I remit to the cenſure of the iudicious reader.

And by occaſion of this paſſage I aduertiſe the reader that wheras the author for the greater credit of his worke, & as it were to limme it with the authoritie of that aureous Doctor S. Auguſtin hath cyted him in his by-way alone, at the leaſte 60. ſeueral tymes: yet hauing diligently viewed and diſcuſſed the places as they ſtade in the tomes, I indoubtedly aſſure him that of thoſe 60 ſentences there ar not 6. to the purpoſe for which they ar alledged, and yet thoſe 6. either ſuch as partely by diuers Romaniſts in their ſeueral worke, and partely by my ſelfe in this my cenſure, haue ſundrie tyme receiued their anſer: the reſt of the total number being ſome of quyte impertinent others neither for our aduerſauerſarie nor againſt the Romaniſts, others plainely againſt him, and for the Romaniſts: eſpecially thoſe which proue the apparent and conſpicuous viſitabilitie of the Catholique Church; others finally ar not ſyncerily rehearſed, but mangled, cropt, or

curtald

curtald with abuſe of the author and reader.

S. Chriſoſtome like wiſe, and S. Ambroſe haue their meaning detorted by the knight in the ſame ſection the one in his 13. homilie vpon Geneſis, in his 7. homilie vpon the firſt epiſtle to the Theſalonians: the other in his 8. ſermon vpon the 118. pſal. for. S. Chriſoſtome onely treates in thoſe places of twoe particular caſes, to wit in the Geneſis he argueth againſt ſome whoe denyed the terreſtriall Paradiſe, and vpon the foreſaid Epiſtle of ſaint Paule, he reprehendes ſome others who were of opiniō that the ſoule is a particle of the diuine nature. And touching theſe two particular points S. Chryſoſtome affirmes that the ſacred ſcripture expondes it ſelfe, and ſuffers not the reader to erre, but he ſaid not that the ſcripture in all other places and in all other matters doth ſoe interpret it ſelfe as Sir Humfrey falſely alledgeth.

Now S. Ambroſe ſaying that the dore ſhall be opened vnto him who diligētly examēs the difficult and obſcure paſſages of ſcripture by no other but by the worde of God, he doth not there meane by the worde of God the ſcriptures them ſelues, but the diuine word that is Chriſt our ſauior the ſecond perſon in Trinitie, and therfore he

addes

addes to the wordes cited by Sir Humfrey. *de quo legisti in Apocalipsi quod Agnus librum signatam aperuit*, of which thou haeſt read in the Apocalips that the lambe opened the ſealed booke, which laſte wordes of S. Ambroſe becauſe the knight perceiued that by their plaine explication of the former, they diſcouered the whole ſentence to be nothing for his purpoſe, he deceitfull ſmunthered and left them vnrehearſed by which his palpable and groſſe abuſe of theſe two graue and ancient authors doth euidently appeare.

An much according to this faſhion he proceeds with Pope Clement whome he citesin the ſame place, and for the ſame purpoſe. Whoe neuertheleſſe is ſoe repugnant to the tenet of the nouelliſts in making the ſole ſcripture interpreter of it ſelfe in all caſes, that he expreſſely teaches that we muſt not according to our owne ſenſe but, *ſecundum traditionem patris*, according to the tradition of the Father, that is either according as the tradition of the Pope him ſelfe as deliuerer of the ſenſe of ſcriptures vnto vs, or *ſecundum traditionem Patris*, that is according to the tradition of the ancient Fathers: and therfore he addes afterwardes. *& ideo oportet ab eo intelligentiam diſcere ſcripturam qui eam a maioribus ſecundum veritatem*

ſibi

sibi traditam reseruauit vt ipse posset ea quæ recte susceperit competenter asserere. That is, And therfore we ought to learne the intelligence or vnderstanding of scriptures of him whoe reserued it to him selfe according to the trueth deliuered vnto him by his ancetors to the end he might cõpetently assert those things which he ritely receiued.

But Sir Humfrey conceiled these wordes, as alsoe the greater parte of the period out of which he cited those wordes he alledges, yet ioined vnto them the rest of those which he rehearseth, not obstanding they ar parte of an other clause, alsoe adding the worde *seeing* which neither is in the authors text, nor agrees with his sense and meaning, which is not that the scripture alone is an intyre and firme rule of faith, but the scripture expounded according to the sense receiued from the ancients, as immediately before he affirmed. But vaine Sir Humfrey was soe desirous to seeme to his reader to haue a Pope for an abetter of his position, that he chused rather to prostitute his owne honestie in the euill vse he made of his authoritie, then seeme to wãt the testiminie of soe renowned a personage. And yet is the knight soe fatre from obtaining his purpose, that if the wordes were not soe manie that they can not with conueniencie

be

be intyrely related, they them ſelues would make it apparent how much the author of them is abuſed by the falſe relater. The ſupplye of which I remit to the more diligent reader as tyme & leaſure ſhall giue him occaſion.

But I confeſſe now I am quite tired with the examen of my aduerſaries miſalledged teſtimonies of the authors he produces in fauor of his miſremormed doctrine and muſt needs draw my ſelfe to a concluſion of my labors, hoping I need not doubte but by theſe fewe paſſages the reader will eaſily perſuade him ſelfe touching the reſt they ar all of the ſame nature and ſoe be ſatisfyed with that implicit or general knowledge he will haue of them by this meanes, and his owne diſcourſe, althou perhaps by his owne induſtrie and inquiſitiō he is not able in particular to diſcouer the fraudes and come to the true ſenſe and menning of thē in anie more expreſſe and declared manner. Yet if my aduerſarie him ſelfe will not be ſatisfyed with this compendious courſe I haue vſed, but will farther require an exacte anſer to euerie particular allegation, vpon condition he will firſt iuſtifye his proceeding in theſe I haue ſhewed defectiue, I promiſſe with Gods

assistance I will be readie both to maintaine soe much as I haue alreadie done and said, and alsoe to proceed farther in my view and censure of those places which as yet I haue not touched if God be pleased to giue me health and opportunitie of bookes, these being the greatest difficulties I haue had im the performance of the worke.

To omit the printe which is well knowne what a trouble in is vnto those of our Religion and nation, and how great an aduãtange our aduersaries haue of vs in these particulars, some of vs being forced to passe the seaes for euerie smale matter we haue to publish, besydes the perill of importing the bookes into the countrie, which is subiect to immunerable casualities and daungers of molestation for the same as experience doth testifye, God almightie amend it and restrore vs to our ancient Catholique libertie and Religion.

And to returne to thee proceeding of my aduersarie I say for a man some tymes inculpably to erre, or mystake either in wordes or sense especially in intricate matters, I doe not admire it, neither dare I iustifye my selfe in that particular

cular (I let passe the faultes of the printer to which euerie one is subiect) but that one should erre soe frequently and grossely as Sr. Humfrey hath erred in his citations of all sortes of authors both ancient and moderne in the whole discourse of his two bookes, and yet neuer in fauor of his aduersaries, but euer in fauor of his owne cause, this I say is no way excusable, and in my opinion it is such a fortune as chanceth to no creature excepting him selfe, or some of his illuminate brothers.

That which I soe much the more lament and deplore in regarde he hath not onely suffered his owne proper iudgement to be insotted with such inconsiderate delusions but likewise, as I perceiue by reporte of others, hath by the same prestigious sleightes deliuered his owne neareſt and deareſt freind his ingenuous ladie, whose otherwise well disposed and once Catholike iudgement, if yet he had conuinced by syncere proceeding and honeſt vse of scriptures, Fathers, and other writers, it had ben lesse intolerable, but to winne her with such false wares as these, is an action no way iustifiable either before God or men.

And if I might be admitted to your Counſell Sir Humfrey, I would aduiſe you to ceaſe writing bookes in this nature, which is neither your profeſſion neither as I conceiue, and am informed, ar you able to performe anie ſuch worke without the aſſiſtance of tutors which muſt of neceſſitie be chargeable vnto you. A dozen or ſixteene of the Puritan Miniſtrie will quickely make a greate hole in an ordinarie knights eſtate, eſpecially if they be aſſembled in ſuch a place as the wine office, which as the verie ſounde of the worde denotes, neceſſarily implyes much good fellowſhip and conſequently greate xpenſe. Beware of that black garde, they will haunte your houſe like ſo maine ill ſpirits, not ſo much by night as by day: they ar meridian ſpirits, they aſſaulte moſt in the mideſt of the leight, therby to daſle mens eyes more eaſily, aboute dinner tyme you ſhal be ſure to haue them moſt buſie aboute you.

For as a conceited Proteſtant reportes. *Where the meat is beſt ther a Puritan confutes moſt, for* (ſaith hee) *his arguing is but the efficacie of his eating, and the Pope he beſt concludes againſt in plum broth.* This conſell proceedes from a freind, wher-

fore

fore if you pleaſe to make vſe of it, the profit will be your owne, the thankes due to mee. This is now the third anſer your firſt booke hath receiued by men of three ſeueral profeſſions, by a marchant, a preiſt, an a clerke, *triplex funis difficile rumpitur* which cordes I hope will tye your iudgement with in the boundes of reaſon. Fare you well Sir Humfrey in Chriſt our Sauior, and receiue this as from him who deſires nothing more then your moſte happie reclamation, & ſempiternal bleſſednes.

FINIS.